arXiv:1408.1849v1 [math.PR] 8 Aug 2014

Orthogonal polynomials in the cumulative Ord family and its application to variance bounds

GIORGOS AFENDRAS[1,*], NARAYANASWAMY BALAKRISHNAN[2,**] and NICKOS PAPADATOS[1,†]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, Section of Statistics and O.R., University of Athens, Panepistemiopolis, 157 84 Athens, Greece*

[2]*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada*

E-mail: [*]g_afendras@math.uoa.gr; [**]bala@mcmaster.ca; [†]npapadat@math.uoa.gr

Abstract: This article presents and reviews several basic properties of the cumulative Ord family of distributions. This family contains all the commonly used discrete distributions. Also, for any random variable X of this family and for any suitable function g in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$, the article provides useful relationships between the Fourier coefficients of g (with respect to the orthonormal polynomial system associated to X), and the Fourier coefficients of the forward difference of g (with respect to another system of polynomials, orthonormal with respect to another distribution of the system). Finally, using these properties, a class of bounds of the variance of $g(X)$ are obtained, in terms of the forward differences of g. The present bounds unify and improve many existing bounds.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60E15.

Keywords and phrases: Completeness, Cumulative Ord family, Differences of higher order, Fourier coefficients, L^2 Hilbert spaces, Orthogonal polynomials, Parseval identity, Quadratic polynomial, Rodrigues-type formula, Variance bounds.

1. Indroduction

Ord (1972) introduced the discrete analogue of Pearson's system. Ord's family contains all integer-valued random variables (rv's) whose probability mass function (pmf), p, satisfies

$$\frac{\Delta p(j-1)}{p(j)} = \frac{a-j}{(a+b_0)+(b_1-1)j+b_2 j(j-1)}. \tag{1.1}$$

Here, Δ is the forward difference operator $[\Delta f(j) = f(j+1) - f(j)]$, $p(j) = \mathbb{P}(X = j)$ is the pmf of the discrete random variable X and j takes values in an integer interval. In the sequel, the term "discrete rv" is customized to mean "integer-valued rv". The equation (1.1) is the discrete analogue of Pearson's differential equation. Ord classified these distributions according to the values of the parameters a, b_0, b_1 and b_2, see Johnson, Kotz and Balakrishnan (2005, Table 2.1, p. 87) .

This paper is concerned with the cumulative Ord family of discrete distributions, defined as follows.

***Definition* 1.1** (cumulative Ord family)**.** Let X be a discrete rv with finite mean μ and pmf $p(j) = \mathbb{P}(X = j)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We say that X belongs to the cumulative Ord family (or p belongs to the cumulative Ord system) if there exists a quadratic $q(j) = \delta j^2 + \beta j + \gamma$ such that

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - k) p(k) = q(j) p(j) \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.2}$$

If (1.2) is satisfied we write $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$ or $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$, or more explicitly X or $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$.

Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$. Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011) studied the orthogonal polynomials generated by a Rodrigues-type formula – see Theorem 5.1 below. Also, using Bessel's inequality, they showed that

$$\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) \geqslant \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{\mathbb{E}^2 q^{[k]}(X) \Delta^k g(X)}{k! \mathbb{E} q^{[k]}(X) \prod_{j=k-1}^{2k-2} (1 - j\delta)}. \tag{1.3}$$

The equality holds iff g coincides with a polynomial of degree at most m in the support of X. For $q^{[k]}$ and Δ^k see Notations 2.1, below.

Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2007) showed a discrete Mohr and Noll inequality. By applying this discrete Mohr and Noll inequality to a random variable X of the CO family, they established Poincaré-type upper/lower bounds for the variance of $g(X)$, of the form

$$(-1)^n [\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_n] \geqslant 0, \quad \text{where} \quad S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{\mathbb{E} q^{[k]}(X) (\Delta^k g(X))^2}{k! \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} (1 - j\delta)}. \tag{1.4}$$

The equality holds iff g is identified with a polynomial of degree at most n in the support of X.

We first present a simple example, in order to illustrate the improvement achieved by the results of the present article. Let $X \sim \mathrm{Poisson}(\lambda)$. For $m = n = 1$, (1.3) and (1.4) produce the double inequality

$$\lambda \mathbb{E}^2 \Delta g(X) \leqslant \mathsf{Var}\, g(X) \leqslant \lambda \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(X)]^2, \tag{1.5}$$

where both equalities hold iff g is a linear polynomial. Applying the results of the present paper, see Theorem 7.1, we get the strengthened inequality

$$\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) \leqslant \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E}^2 \Delta g(X) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(X)]^2, \tag{1.6}$$

in which the equality holds iff g is a polynomial of degree at most two. It is clear that the upper bound in (1.6) improves the upper bound in (1.5) and, in fact, it is strictly better, unless g is linear.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we present the basic properties of cumulative Ord family of distributions. In Section 3 we give an algorithm, Table 3.1, which checks if a pair

$(\mu; q)$ is admissible, according to the Definition 3.1. Also, we provide a detailed classification of the cumulative Ord family. It turns out that, up to an (integer-valued) location transformation and/or multiplication by -1, there are six different types of pmf's, described in Table 3.2. In Section 4 we show that for any $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$, the pmf $p_i \propto q^{[i]}p$ belongs to CO system, under appropriate moments conditions. Also, using a known covariance identity, we obtain closed expressions for $\mathsf{Var}(X_i)$ (when $X_i \sim p_i$) and for $\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)$. Recurrence relations for the factorial moments are also given. In Section 5 we study the Rodrigues-type orthogonal polynomials of a random variable belonging to the CO family. The main result of this section is that the forward differences of orthogonal polynomials of a pmf within the CO system are also orthogonal polynomials corresponding to another pmf of the system, see Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. In Section 6 we present expressions for the Fourier coefficients of a function g in L^2, with respect to the corresponding orthonormal polynomials. One of the important facts is that when the polynomials are dense in L^2, the quantity $\mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)[\Delta^n g(X)]^2$ can be expressed as a series (finite or infinite) in terms of the Fourier coefficients of g. In section 7, applying the series expansion for $\mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)[\Delta^n g(X)]^2$ we present a wide class of (upper/lower) bounds for $\mathsf{Var}\, g(X)$.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we show a number of key properties of the cumulative Ord family. In the sequel we shall make use of the following notations.

***Note* 2.1.** (a) $S \equiv S(X)$ is the support of a discrete rv X, i.e., $S = \{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \mathbb{P}(X = j) > 0\}$. Also, we define $S_\circ := S \setminus \{\text{the lower endpoint of } S\}$ and $S^\circ := S \setminus \{\text{the upper endpoint of } S\}$. Of course, if S has not a finite lower (upper) endpoint then $S_\circ = S$ ($S^\circ = S$).

(b) $f^{[k]}(x) = f(x)f(x+1)\cdots f(x+k-1)$ with $f^{[0]}(x) = 1$, the k-th order ascending power.

(c) $[x]_k = x^{[k]} = x(x+1)\cdots(x+k-1)$ with $[x]_0 = 1$, the k-th ascending factorial.

(d) $(x)_k = (-1)^k[-x]_k = x(x-1)\cdots(x-k+1)$ with $(x)_0 = 1$, the k-th descending factorial.

(e) $\Delta^k = \Delta(\Delta^{k-1})$ with $\Delta^0 = I$, the k-th order forward difference operator.

***Remark* 2.1.** For every discrete rv X with finite mean μ and pmf p, the function $f(j) = \sum_{k \leqslant j}(\mu - k)p(k)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ is non-negative, unimodal (increases up to the integral part of mean, $[\mu]$, and next decreases) and takes its maximum value at the point $j = [\mu]$ (of course if $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ then the function attains its maximum value at the points $\mu - 1$ and μ).

***Definition* 2.1.** A subset S of $\mathbb{Z}$ is called *integer chain* if for every $j_1, j_2 \in S$ with $j_1 \leqslant j_2$ it follows that $[j_1, j_2] \cap \mathbb{Z} \subseteq S$.

From Definition 1.1 we can show the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$. Then:*

(a) *The rv is supported on an integer chain, denoted by* $S = \{\alpha, \alpha+1, \ldots, \omega\}$, *where* $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ *and* $\omega \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ *with* $\alpha \leqslant \omega$. *Thus,* $S_\circ = \{\alpha+1, \ldots, \omega\}$ *and* $S^\circ = \{\alpha, \ldots, \omega-1\}$. *Note that if* $\alpha = \omega$ *then* $S_\circ = S^\circ = \varnothing$.

(b) $q(j) > 0$ *for all* $j \in S^\circ$.

(c) *If* $\omega < \infty$ *then* $q(\omega) = 0$. *If* $\alpha = 0$ *then* $\mu = q(0) = \gamma$ *and, in general, if* $\alpha > -\infty$ *then* $q(\alpha) = \mu - \alpha$.

(d) *For every* $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ *the rv* $Y = X + r$ *follows* $\mathrm{CO}(\mu_Y = \mu + r; q_Y(j) = q(j-r))$.

(e) *The rv* $W = -X$ *follows* $\mathrm{CO}(\mu_W = -\mu; q_W(j) = q(-j) - j - \mu)$.

(f) $\underline{q}(j) > 0$ *for all* $j \in S_\circ$, *where* $\underline{q}(j) := q(j) + j - \mu$.

Proof. (a), (b) and (c) are obvious by (1.2) and Remark 2.1.

(d) The rv Y has mean $\mu_Y = \mu + r$ and support $S(Y) = r + S = \{r + j : j \in S\}$ (integer chain). Observe that

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu_Y - k)\mathbb{P}(Y = k) = \sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - (k-r))\mathbb{P}(X = k - r)$$
$$= \sum_{s \leqslant j-r} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s) = q(j-r)\mathbb{P}(X = j-r) = q(j-r)\mathbb{P}(Y = j).$$

(e) The rv W has mean $\mu_W = -\mu$ and support $S(W) = -S = \{-j : j \in S\}$. Write

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu_W - k)\mathbb{P}(W = k) = \sum_{k \leqslant j} (-\mu - k)\mathbb{P}(X = -k) = -\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - (-k))\mathbb{P}(X = -k)$$
$$= -\sum_{s \geqslant -j} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s) = (-\mu - j)\mathbb{P}(X = -j) - \sum_{s > -j} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s)$$

and observe that $\sum_{s \leqslant -j} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s) + \sum_{s > -j} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s) = 0$. Thus,

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu_W - k)\mathbb{P}(W = k) = (-\mu - j)\mathbb{P}(X = -j) + \sum_{s \leqslant -j} (\mu - s)\mathbb{P}(X = s)$$
$$= (-\mu - j)\mathbb{P}(X = -j) + q(-j)\mathbb{P}(X = -j) = (q(-j) - j - \mu)\mathbb{P}(W = j).$$

(f) It is obvious that $j \in S_\circ(X) \Leftrightarrow -j \in S^\circ(-X)$. Thus, from (b) and (e) we see that for every $j \in S_\circ$, $q_{-X}(-j) > 0$, i.e., $q(j) + j - \mu > 0$. □

Now we present a useful lemma concerning the existence of moments.

Lemma 2.2 (Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2007)). *Let* $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$. *If* $S(X)$ *is finite or* $\delta \leqslant 0$ *then* X *has finite moments of any order. Furthermore, if* $S(X)$ *is infinite and* $\delta > 0$ *then* X *has finite moments of any order* $\theta \in (0, 1 + 1/\delta)$, *while* $\mathbb{E}|X|^{1+1/\delta} = \infty$.

***Remark* 2.2.** We can find a random variable $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu;\delta,\beta,\gamma)$ with $\delta > 0$ and finite support S (with cardinality $|S| \geqslant 3$). However, the inequality $\delta < [2(|S|-2)]^{-1}$ should be necessarily satisfied in this case; see Subsection 3.3.1.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that a discrete rv X is supported on an infinite integer chain $S(X)$, has finite mean μ, and satisfies the relation $\sum_{k\leqslant j}(c-k)p(k) = q(j)p(j)$, $j \in S(X)$, where c is a constant and q is a polynomial of degree at most two. If $S(X)$ is upper (resp., lower) unbounded then $q(j)p(j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$ (resp., $j \to -\infty$).*

Proof. If q is a constant polynomial then the result is obvious, since $p(j)$ is a pmf. If q is a linear polynomial then the result is again obvious, since $\mathbb{E}|X| < \infty$. We shall examine only the case where $q(j) = \delta j^2 + \beta j + \gamma$ with $\delta \neq 0$. If $S(X)$ has not a finite upper bound then the quantity $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}(c-k)p(k) = \lim_{j\to\infty}\sum_{k\leqslant j}(c-k)p(k)$ is well-defined, since $\mathbb{E}|X| < \infty$. Thus, $\lim_{j\to\infty} p(j)q(j) = C \in \mathbb{R}$. Now observe that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} j^2 p(j) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{j^2}{q(j)} q(j)p(j) = C/\delta = \theta \geqslant 0.$$

Assuming $\theta > 0$, we can find an integer $j_0 > 0$ such that $jp(j) > \frac{\theta}{2j}$ for all $j \geqslant j_0$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}|X| = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |j|p(j) \geqslant \sum_{j\geqslant j_0} jp(j) \geqslant \sum_{j\geqslant j_0} \frac{\theta}{2j} = \infty,$$

a contradiction. Therefore $C = \theta = 0$. For the lower unbounded case we can use the same arguments, and the proof is complete. □

The result of Lemma 2.3 applies to all random variables of the CO family whose support is infinite. For this family the results of the above lemma can be generalized, see Proposition 4.2 below.

***Remark* 2.3.** In Lemma 2.3, if the support has not a finite upper bound then, necessarily, the constant c is the mean μ of X, i.e. the rv X belongs to the CO family. However, if the support has a finite upper bound, it may happen $c \neq \mu$. For example, let $X \sim \mathrm{Poisson}(\lambda) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu = \lambda; q(j) = \lambda)$. Then, from Lemma 2.1(e), the rv $W = -X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu_W = -\lambda; q_W(j) = -j)$, i.e., $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{j}(\mu_W - k)p_W(k) = q_W(j)p_W(j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now consider the truncated $\widetilde{W}$ at the point zero $[p_{\widetilde{W}}(j) = \vartheta p_W(j)$, $j = -1,-2,\ldots]$. Then, for each $j \in S(\widetilde{W}) = \{-1,-2,\ldots\}$ we have

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{j}(\mu_W - k)p_{\widetilde{W}}(k) = \vartheta \sum_{k=-\infty}^{j}(\mu_W - k)p_W(k) = \vartheta q_W(j)p_W(j) = (-j)p_{\widetilde{W}}(j)$$

and $\mathbb{E}\widetilde{W} \neq \mu_W$ (note that this $\widetilde{W}$ does not belong to the CO family).

Now we compare the cumulative Ord system, i.e. the pmf's satisfying equation (1.2), with the ordinary Ord system, i.e. the pmf's satisfying the Ord's difference equation (1.1).

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that a discrete rv X has pmf p and finite mean. Then,* (a) *and* (b) *are equivalent:*

(a) $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$.

(b) i. *The support S of X is an integer chain, $S = \{\alpha, \alpha+1, \ldots, \omega\}$ with $\alpha \leqslant \omega$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$, $\omega \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

ii. *There exist polynomials p_1 (of degree at most one) and q (of degree at most two) such that*

$$[\Delta p(j-1)]q(j-1) = p_1(j)p(j), \quad \text{for all } j \in S.$$

iii. *For the above polynomials there exists a constant μ such that $p_1(j) + \Delta q(j-1) = \mu - j$, for all $j \in S$. If $\omega < \infty$ then it is further required that $\mu = \mathbb{E}X$.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$" is obvious.

We prove "$\Leftarrow$". Note that we do not assume that μ is the mean of X. Combining ii. and iii. we have, after some algebra, that $p(j)(\mu - j) = \Delta[p(j-1)q(j-1)]$. Fix an integer i with $i \leqslant j$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=i}^{j} p(k)(\mu - k) = p(j)q(j) - p(i-1)q(i-1).$$

If $\alpha > -\infty$ we choose $i = \alpha$ and since $p(\alpha - 1) = 0$ we have

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} p(k)(\mu - k) = \sum_{k=\alpha}^{j} p(k)(\mu - k) = p(j)q(j),$$

for all $j \in S$. For $\alpha = -\infty$, since $\mathbb{E}|X| < \infty$, the quantity

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - k)p(k) = \lim_{i \to -\infty} \sum_{k=i}^{j} (\mu - k)p(k)$$

is well-defined. Thus, $\lim_{i \to -\infty} p(i-1)q(i-1) = C \in \mathbb{R}$. If q is at most of degree one then it is obvious that $C = 0$. If $q(j) = \delta j^2 + \beta j + \gamma$, $\delta \neq 0$, we use the same arguments as in proof of Lemma 2.3 and we conclude that $C = 0$. Thus, in any case, $\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - k)p(k) = q(j)p(j)$, $j \in S$. The proof is completed by Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.3. □

Are all the assumptions of Proposition 2.1(b) necessary for the CO family? This question is being studied right now:

***Remark* 2.4.** It is clear that ii. is necessary for all $j \in S$.

Regarding the assumption i., consider the rv X with pmf $p(0) = p(2) = 0.5$ and observe that ii. and iii. are fulfilled for $p_1(j) = 2 - j$, $q(j) = 1 - j$ and $\mu = 1 = \mathbb{E}X$. But this rv does not belong to the cumulative Ord family.

Regarding the assumption iii., consider the truncated Poisson $X \sim p(j) \propto \lambda^j / j!$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$. Observe that i.–iii. are satisfied for $p_1(j) = \lambda - j$, $q(j) = \lambda$ and $\mu = \lambda$. However, the rv X does not belong to the cumulative Ord family since $\lambda \neq \mathbb{E}X$; this happened because S has a finite upper end-point.

3. A complete classification of the cumulative Ord family

In this section we classify the distributions of the Ord family. The classification is based on the mean μ and the parameters of the quadratic q. The most important role is played by the parameter δ, the coefficient of the square power of q.

The natural question is to ask whether the mean μ and the quadratic q, together, characterize the distribution. The answer is given by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. (a) *If the rv X follows the* CO$(\mu; q)$ *distribution, then the support $S(X)$ is uniquely determined by μ and q.*

(b) *The distribution is characterized by the pair $(\mu; q)$.*

Proof. (a) First we consider the special case where $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q(\mu) = 0$. From Remark 2.1 it follows easily that the rv takes the value μ with probability 1.

In any other case, we define $N \equiv N(\mu; q) = \{\text{the first } j \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [\mu, \infty) \text{ such that } q(N) \leqslant 0\}$. If $N = \infty$ then the support $S(X)$ has not a finite upper end-point, otherwise the value N is the upper end-point of $S(X)$ and, then, $q(N) = 0$ (otherwise the pair $(\mu; q)$ could not satisfy the relation (1.2)).

Regarding the lower endpoint: The rv $-X$ follows CO$(\mu_{-X}; q_{-X})$ with $S(-X) = -S(X)$, $\mu_{-X} = -\mu_X$ and $q_{-X}(j) = q(-j) - j - \mu$. As before, we can determine $N' \equiv N(\mu_{-X}; q_{-X})$. If $N' = \infty$ then the support $S(-X)$ has not a finite upper endpoint, i.e. the support $S(X)$ has not a finite lower endpoint. Otherwise, the value N' is the upper end-point of $S(-X)$, i.e. $-N'$ is the lower end-point of $S(X)$.

(b) For the trivial case where X assumes an integer value with probability 1 we have nothing to prove. In the general case, consider the pmf $p(j)$ of X and its support, $S(X)$, which is determined by the pair $(\mu; q)$. Let $\widetilde{p}(j) \sim$ CO$(\mu; q)$. We shall show that $p = \widetilde{p}$. For any $j - 1$, $j \in S(X)$, (1.2) shows that

$$\frac{p(j-1)}{p(j)} = \frac{q(j) + j - \mu}{q(j-1)} =: \alpha(j).$$

Fix $j_0 \in S(X)$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with $j_0 + k \in S(X)$ it follows that

$$p(j_0 + k) = \frac{p(j_0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} \alpha(j_0 + i)} := \beta_{j_0}(k) p(j_0).$$

Also, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with $j_0 - k \in S(X)$, it follows that

$$p(j_0 - k) = p(j_0) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha(j_0 + i) := \gamma_{j_0}(k) p(j_0).$$

Similarly, $\widetilde{p}(j_0+k) = \beta_{j_0}(k)\widetilde{p}(j_0)$ and $\widetilde{p}(j_0-k) = \gamma_{j_0}(k)\widetilde{p}(j_0)$. Finally, consider the positive number $\theta := \widetilde{p}(j_0)/p(j_0)$. Then, from the above relations we see that $\widetilde{p}(j) = \theta p(j)$ for all $j \in S(X)$. Since p and $\widetilde{p}$ are pmf's we conclude that $\theta = 1$. □

***Definition* 3.1.** Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q(j) = \delta j^2 + \beta j + \gamma$. We say that the pair $(\mu; q)$ is *admissible* if there exists a pmf p in the CO system such that $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$.

Now, the natural question is "How one can check the admissibility of a given pair $(\mu; q)$?" Also, if a pair is admissible, how does the corresponding pmf can be obtained by this pair? The answer is given by the algorithm in Table 3.1.

Next we present a detailed classification of the CO system.

3.1. The case $\delta = 0$

We have to further distinguish between the cases $\beta = 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$.

3.1.1. The subcase $\beta = 0$

That is, $q(j) = \gamma > 0$. The support S has not a finite upper end-point but it must have a finite lower end-point (since the quadratic $q_{-X}(j) = \gamma - j - \mu$ of $-X$, see Lemma 2.1(e), takes negative values for large values of j). Without lost of generality we assume $S = \mathbb{N}$. Since $\alpha = 0$, $\mu = \gamma$. Observe that the Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda = \gamma$ follows $\mathrm{CO}(\gamma; 0, 0, \gamma)$. Using Proposition 3.1, we have that $X \sim \mathrm{Poisson}(\gamma)$ [Poisson-type distributions].

3.1.2. The subcase $\beta \neq 0$

We have the following sub-subcases.

(i) The sub-subcase $\beta > 0$
The support S has not a finite upper end-point but it has a lower one. Again we may assume that $S = \mathbb{N}$ (of course $\mu > 0$). Since $\alpha = 0$, $q(j) = \beta j + \mu$. Consider the Negative Binomial distribution with parameters $r = \beta/\mu > 0$ and $p = 1/(1+\beta) \in (0, 1)$, i.e., with pmf

$$p(j) = \frac{[r]_j}{j!} p^r (1-p)^j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots,$$

which follows $\mathrm{CO}(\mu; 0, \beta, \mu)$. From Proposition 3.1, $X \sim \mathrm{NB}(r = \beta/\mu, p = 1/(1+\beta))$ [Negative Binomial-type distributions].

(ii) The sub-subcase $-1 < \beta < 0$
The support S has a finite upper end-point. Also, $q_{-X}(j) = -(1+\beta)j + \gamma - \mu$ where $-(1+\beta) < 0$. Thus, S has a finite lower end-point. Assume that $S = \{0, 1, \ldots, N\}$ and $0 < \mu < N$. Since $q(0) = \mu$, $q(N) = 0$ and q is a linear polynomial, we get $q(j) = \frac{\mu}{N}(N - j)$. Consider the Binomial distribution with parameters N and $p = \mu/N$, i.e.,

$$p(j) = \binom{N}{j} p^j (1-p)^{N-j}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, N,$$

which follows $\mathrm{CO}(p; 0, -p, Np)$. From Proposition 3.1 we see that $X \sim \mathrm{B}(N, p = \mu)$ [Binomial-type distributions].

Table 3.1. Admissibility of the pair $(\mu; q)$.

Step 1 Set $\underline{q}(j) = q(j) + j - \mu$ and

$$\alpha := \sup\{j \in (-\infty, \mu] \cap \mathbb{Z} : \underline{q}(j) = 0\}, \quad \omega := \inf\{j \in [\mu, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z} : q(j) = 0\}, \tag{3.1}$$

noting that $\sup \varnothing = -\infty$ and $\inf \varnothing = \infty$. Also, define $S = \{\alpha, \alpha + 1, \ldots, \omega\}$. The pair $(\mu; q)$ is admissible if and only if $q(j) > 0$ for all $j \in S^\circ$ and $\underline{q}(j) > 0$ for all $j \in S_\circ$. If $(\mu; q)$ is admissible, go to Step 2; end otherwise.

Step 2 (i) If $\alpha > -\infty$, using the recurrence $p(k) = \frac{q(k-1)}{\underline{q}(k)} p(k-1)$ for all $k \in S_\circ$, we get

$$p(\alpha + i) = C \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{i-1} q(\alpha + k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{i} \underline{q}(\alpha + k)}, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, \omega - \alpha, \tag{3.2}$$

where C is the normalizing constant.

(ii) If $\alpha = -\infty$ and $\omega < \infty$, using the same recurrence we get

$$p(\omega - i) = C \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{i-1} \underline{q}(\omega - k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{i} q(\omega - k)}, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, \omega - \alpha, \tag{3.3}$$

where C is the normalizing constant.

(iii) If $\alpha = -\infty$ and $\omega = \infty$, using the same recurrence we obtain

$$p(j) = C \left[\frac{\prod_{k=0}^{j-1} q(k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{j} \underline{q}(k)} \mathbb{1}_{j \geqslant 0} + \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{|j|-1} \underline{q}(-k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{|j|} q(-k)} \mathbb{1}_{j<0} \right], \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{3.4}$$

where C is the normalizing constant.

By construction it follows that for all three cases, $p(j+1) = \frac{q(j)}{q(j+1)+j+1-\mu} p(j)$ for any $j \in S^\circ$. As in the analysis presented by Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2007, Lemma 4.1, pp. 176–178), one can see that $\sum_{j \in S} |j| p(j) < \infty$, and hence, $\sum_{j \in S} p(j) < \infty$ (and the mean of X is finite).

Step 3 [Check that the pmf's of Step 2 belongs to the CO system with the given μ and q]
By construction, the pmf's of (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) satisfy the relation

$$[\Delta p(j-1)] q(j-1) = [-\Delta q(j-1) - j + \mu] p(j), \quad j \in S.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2.1 we get

$$\sum_{k \leqslant j} (\mu - k) p(k) = q(j) p(j), \quad j \in S.$$

If $\omega = \infty$ then $q(j)p(j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, see Lemma 2.3. Thus, $\sum_{k \in S} (\mu - k) p(k) = 0$, i.e., μ is the mean value. If $\omega < \infty$ then $q(\omega) = 0$, by construction. Thus, $\sum_{k \in S} (\mu - k) p(k) = \sum_{k \leqslant \omega} (\mu - k) p(k) = q(\omega) p(\omega) = 0$, i.e., μ is the mean value.
Of course, in practice this step can be skipped.

(iii) The sub-subcase $\beta = -1$
Here $q_{-X}(j) = \gamma - \mu$ (constant). Thus, this sub-subcase is the negative of the case 3.1.1. [Poisson-type distributions].

(iv) The sub-subcase $\beta < -1$
Here $q_{-X}(j) = -(1+\beta)j + \gamma - \mu$ with $-(1+\beta) > 0$. Thus, this sub-subcase is the negative of the case 3.1.2(i). [Negative Binomial-type distributions].

3.2. The case $\delta < 0$

It is obvious that the support S is finite. Without loss of generality assume that $S = \{0, 1, \ldots, N\}$ with $0 < \mu < N$. Since $q(N) = 0$ and $q(0) = \mu$, it follows that $q(j) = \delta(\mu/(N\delta) - j)(N - j)$. Consider now the Negative Hypergeometric distribution with parameters $N \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$, $r = -\mu/(N\delta) > 0$ and $s = (\mu - N)/(N\delta) > 0$, i.e., with pmf

$$p(j) = \binom{N}{j} \frac{(-r)_j (-s)_{N-j}}{(-r-s)_N}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, N.$$

This follows $\mathrm{CO}(\frac{Nr}{r+s}; \frac{-1}{r+s}, \frac{N-r}{r+s}, \frac{Nr}{r+s})$. From Proposition 3.1, $X \sim \mathrm{NHgeo}(N; r, s)$ [Negative Hypergeometric-type distributions].

3.3. The case $\delta > 0$

We study the following subcases, related to the support.

3.3.1. Finite S

Set $S = \{0, 1, \ldots, N\}$ and $0 < \mu < N$. As in Subsection 3.2 ($\delta < 0$), it follows that $q(j) = \delta(\mu/(N\delta) - j)(N - j)$. From Lemma 2.1(b) we get $\mu/(N\delta) - (N-1) > 0$, equivalently $\delta < \frac{\mu}{N(N-1)}$. Now, since $q(j) = j(\delta j + (1 - \mu/N - N\delta))$, from Lemma 2.1(f) we have that $\delta + (1 - \mu/N - N\delta) > 0$, equivalently $\delta < \frac{N-\mu}{N(N-1)}$. Thus, it follows that

$$0 < \delta < \frac{\min\{\mu, N-\mu\}}{N(N-1)}.$$

Note that $\frac{\min\{\mu, N-\mu\}}{N(N-1)} \leqslant \frac{1}{2(N-1)}$. Consider the Hypergeometric distribution, with parameters $N \in \{2, 3, \ldots\}$, $r = \mu/(N\delta) > N - 1$ and $s = (N - \mu)/(N\delta) > N - 1$, with pmf

$$p(j) = \binom{N}{j} \frac{(r)_j (s)_{N-j}}{(r+s)_N}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, N.$$

Thus, $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\frac{Nr}{r+s}; \frac{1}{r+s}, -\frac{r+N}{r+s}, \frac{Nr}{r+s})$. From Proposition 3.1, $X \sim \mathrm{Hgeo}(N; r, s)$ [Hypergeometric-type distributions].

3.3.2. One-side infinite S

First we give an example. Let $q(j) = j^2 + 1$ and $\mu = 1$. It follows that $\underline{q}(j) = j(j+1)$. Applying the algorithm of Table 3.1, Step 1 gives $\alpha = 0$ and $\omega = \infty$, namely $S = \mathbb{N}$, and the pair $(\mu; q) = (1; j^2 + 1)$ is admissible. By Step 2 we find the pmf $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(1; 1, 0, 1)$:

$$p(j) = \frac{\pi}{\sinh(\pi)} \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{j-1}(k^2+1)}{j!(j+1)!}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots \ .$$

This pmf can be written as

$$p(j) = \frac{\pi}{\sinh(\pi)} \frac{[\imath]_j[-\imath]_j}{j!(j+1)!}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\imath$ is the complex unity.

In the general case set $S = \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu > 0$. Since $\alpha = 0$, the quadratic q is of the form $q(j) = \delta j^2 + \beta j + \mu$. Write $q(j) = \delta(j + z_1)(j + z_2)$, where $-z_1, -z_2$ are the complex roots of q. Since $q(j) > 0$ for every $j = 0, 1, \dots$, we have that $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{C}_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, where

$$\mathfrak{C}_2 := \{(z, \overline{z}) : \ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\} \cup (0, \infty)^2 \cup \left[\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (-n-1, -n)^2\right]. \tag{3.6}$$

Also, it is required that $\underline{q}(j) = \delta j(j + \frac{\beta+1}{\delta})$ is positive for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Thus, $\rho := \frac{\beta+\delta+1}{\delta} > 0$; equivalently, $\beta > -\delta - 1$. Under the above restrictions, the pair $(\mu; q)$ is admissible. Step 2 of the algorithm then yields

$$p(j) = \frac{\Gamma(\rho - z_1)\Gamma(\rho - z_2)}{\Gamma(\rho)\Gamma(\varsigma)} \frac{[z_1]_j[z_2]_j}{j![\rho]_j}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\varsigma = 1 + 1/\delta$. Note that the substitution $z_1 \mapsto \imath$, $z_2 \mapsto -\imath$ and $\rho \mapsto 2$ yields (3.5). [Generalized Inverse Polya-type distributions].

3.3.3. Two-side infinite S

First we give an example. Let $q(j) = j^2 + 1$ and $\mu = 0$. It follows that $\underline{q}(j) = j^2 + j + 1$. Applying the algorithm of Table 3.1, Step 1 gives $\alpha = -\infty$ and $\omega = \infty$, namely $S = \mathbb{Z}$, and the pair $(\mu; q) = (0; j^2 + 1)$ is admissible. By Step 2 we find the pmf of $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(0; 1, 0, 1)$:

$$p(j) = C \left[\frac{[\imath]_j[-\imath]_j}{\left[\frac{3}{2} + \imath\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right]_j \left[\frac{3}{2} - \imath\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right]_j} \mathbb{1}_{j \geqslant 0} + \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} + \imath\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)_{|j|} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \imath\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)_{|j|}}{(-1+\imath)_{|j|}(-1-\imath)_{|j|}} \mathbb{1}_{j<0} \right], \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.8}$$

Note that the above choice of $(\mu; q)$ forces S to be the entire $\mathbb{Z}$. In general, let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $q(j) = \delta(z_1 + j)(z_2 + j)$ and $\underline{q}(j) = \delta(w_1 + j)(w_2 + j)$, where $-z_1, -z_2$ and $-w_1, -w_2$ are the complex roots of

q and $\underline{q}$, respectively. Since $q(j) > 0$ and $\underline{q}(j) > 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, it follows that $(z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_2$, where

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_2 := \{(z, \overline{z}) : \ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\} \cup \Big[\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (n, n+1)^2\Big]; \tag{3.9}$$

noting that the pair (w_1, w_2) is a function of $(\mu; q)$, i.e., a function of the values μ, δ, z_1 and z_2. The pair $(\mu; q)$ is admissible, see Step 1 of algorithm in Table 3.1. By Step 2 we find the pmf, cf. Ord (1968),

$$p(j) = C\Big[\frac{[z_1]_j [z_2]_j}{[w_1+1]_j [w_2+1]_j} \mathbb{1}_{j\geqslant 0} + \frac{(w_1)_{|j|}(w_2)_{|j|}}{(z_1-1)_{|j|}(z_2-1)_{|j|}} \mathbb{1}_{j<0}\Big], \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{3.10}$$

where C is the normalizing constant. Note that by the substitution $z_1 \mapsto \imath$, $z_2 \mapsto -\imath$, $w_1 \mapsto 1+\imath\sqrt{3}$ and $w_1 \mapsto 1-\imath\sqrt{3}$, (3.10) gives (3.8). [Discrete Student-type distributions].

***Remark* 3.1.** It is easy to check that if the cardinality $|S|$ of the support is equals to 2, then the different types lead to identical distributions (since every such random variable is Bernoulli).

All the above possibilities are summarized in Table 3.2.

4. Moment relations in cumulative Ord family

This section presents a few properties related to the moments of a random variable of the cumulative Ord family.
For a discrete rv $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) \equiv \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$, the following covariance identity holds

$$\mathsf{Cov}(X, g(X)) = \mathbb{E}q(X)\Delta g(X), \tag{4.1}$$

provided that $\mathbb{E}q(X)|\Delta g(X)| < \infty$, see Cacoullos and Papathanasiou (1989). Setting $g(x) = x$ we get

$$\sigma^2 := \mathsf{Var}\, X = \mathbb{E}q(X), \tag{4.2}$$

provided $\mathbb{E}X^2 < \infty$. Writing $q(X) = \delta(X-\mu)^2 + q'(\mu)(X-\mu) + q(\mu)$ and taking expectations we have

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{q(\mu)}{1-\delta}, \tag{4.3}$$

noting that from Lemma 2.2 and Remarks 2.2 and 3.1, the denominator $1-\delta$ is positive.

Now we prove a lemma concerning the pmf $p^*(j) \propto q(j)p(j)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that the non-constant rv $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$ and that $\mathbb{E}|X|^3 < \infty$. Let X^* be the rv with pmf $p^*(j) = \frac{q(j)p(j)}{\mathbb{E}q(X)}$. Then X^* is supported on the set $S(X^*) := S^\circ(X)$ (i.e., $\alpha^* = \alpha$, $\omega^* = \omega - 1$) and $X^* \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu^*; q^*)$ where $\mu^* = \frac{\mu+\beta+\delta}{1-2\delta}$ and $q^*(j) = \frac{q(j+1)}{1-2\delta}$.*

Table 3.2.. Probabilities of the cumulative Ord family

type **usual notation**	***p(j)***	**support *S***	***q(j)***	**parameters**	**mean μ**	**classification rule**
1. Poisson-type $X \sim P(\lambda)$	$e^{-\lambda}\frac{\lambda^j}{j!}$	$\mathbb{N}$	λ	$\lambda > 0$	λ	$\delta = \beta = 0$
2. Binomial-type $X \sim B(N,p)$	$\binom{N}{j}p^j(1-p)^{N-j}$	$0,1,\ldots,N$	$p(N-j)$	$N = 1,2,\ldots$ $0 < p < 1$	Np	$\delta = 0$ $\beta = -p \in (-1,0)$
3. Negative Binomial-type $X \sim NB(r,p)$	$\frac{[r]_j}{j!}p^r(1-p)^j$	$\mathbb{N}$	$\frac{1-p}{p}(r+j)$	$r > 0$ $0 < p < 1$	$\frac{r(1-p)}{p}$	$\delta = 0$ $\beta = \frac{1-p}{p} > 0$
4a. Negative Hypergeometric-type $X \sim NHgeo(N;r,s)$	$\binom{N}{j}\frac{(-r)_j(-s)_{N-j}}{(-r-s)_N}$	$0,1,\ldots,N$	$\frac{(r+j)(N-j)}{r+s}$	$N = 1,2,\ldots$ $r,s > 0$	$\frac{Nr}{r+s}$	$\delta = \frac{-1}{r+s} < 0$
4b. Hypergeometric-type $X \sim Hgeo(N;r,s)$	$\binom{N}{j}\frac{(r)_j(s)_{N-j}}{(-r-s)_N}$	$0,1,\ldots,N$	$\frac{(r-j)(N-j)}{r+s}$	$N = 1,2,\ldots$ $r,s > N-1$	$\frac{Nr}{r+s}$	$\delta = \frac{1}{r+s} > 0$ finite S
5. Inverse Polya-type[1] $X \sim InvPolya(\rho;r,s)$	$\frac{\Gamma(\rho-r)\Gamma(\rho-s)}{\Gamma(\rho-r-s)\Gamma(\rho)}\frac{[r]_j[s]_j}{j![\rho]_j}$	$\mathbb{N}$	$\frac{(r+j)(s+j)}{\rho-r-s-1}$	$(r,s) \in \mathfrak{C}_2$ $\rho > \max\{0, r+s+1\}$	$\frac{rs}{\rho-r-s-1}$	$\delta = \frac{1}{\rho-r-s-1} > 0$ one-side infinite S
6. Discrete Student-type[2,3] $X \sim$ Disc.$t(\{z_1,z_2\},\{w_1,w_2\})$	$C\Big[\frac{[z_1]_j[z_2]_j}{[w_1+1]_j[w_2+1]_j}\mathbb{1}_{j\geqslant 0}$ $+\frac{(w_1)_{\lvert j\rvert}(w_2)_{\lvert j\rvert}}{(z_1-1)_{\lvert j\rvert}(z_2-1)_{\lvert j\rvert}}\mathbb{1}_{j<0}\Big]$	$\mathbb{Z}$	$\frac{(z_1+j)(z_2+j)}{w_1+w_2-z_1-z_2}$	$(z_1,z_2),(w_1,w_2) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_2$: $w_1+w_2 > z_1+z_2$	$\frac{z_1z_2-w_1w_2}{w_1+w_2-z_1-z_2}$	$\delta = \frac{1}{w_1+w_2-z_1-z_2} > 0$ two-side infinite S

[1] $\mathfrak{C}_2 := \{(z,\overline{z}) :\ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\} \cup (0,\infty)^2 \cup \Big[\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}(-n-1,-n)^2\Big]$.

[2] We was not able to find a closed formula for the normalizing constant C of this pmf.

[3] $\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_2 := \{(z,\overline{z}) :\ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\} \cup \Big[\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}(n,n+1)^2\Big]$.

Proof. From Lemma 2.1(b),(c) it follows that the function p^* is non-negative on $\mathbb{Z}$ and takes strictly positive values on the set $S(X^*) = S^\circ(X)$. Using $\Delta[h_1(k)h_2(k)] = h_1(k)\Delta h_2(k) + h_2(k+1)\Delta h_1(k)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta[q(k)q(k-1)p(k-1)] &= q(k)\Delta[q(k-1)p(k-1)] + q(k)p(k)\Delta q(k)\\ &= q(k)(\mu-k)p(k) + q(k)p(k)(2\delta k+\delta+\beta)\\ &= [\mu+\delta+\beta-(1-2\delta)k]q(k)p(k).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{k\leqslant j}(\mu^*-k)p^*(k) = \frac{\sum_{k\leqslant j}\Delta[q(k)q(k-1)p(k-1)]}{(1-2\delta)\mathbb{E}q(X)}.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}|X|^3 < \infty$, using the same arguments as in proof of Proposition 2.1, it follows that $\sum_{k\leqslant j}\Delta[q(k)q(k-1)p(k-1)] = q(j+1)q(j)p(j)$. So, $\sum_{k\leqslant j}(\mu^*-k)p^*(k) = q^*(j)p^*(j)$. It remains to show that the value μ^* is the mean of X^*. Of course $\mathbb{E}|X^*| < \infty$ since $\mathbb{E}|X|^3 < \infty$. If $S(X^*)$ has a finite upper end-point $\omega^* = \omega - 1$ then $q^*(\omega^*) = \frac{q(\omega)}{1-2\delta} = 0$, since ω is the upper end-point of $S(X)$. If $\omega^* = \omega = \infty$ we use the same arguments as in proof of Proposition 2.1. For both cases, $\sum_{k\in S(X^*)}(\mu^*-k)p^*(k) = 0$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}X^* = \mu^*$. □

The quadratic q takes non-negative values on the support of X. Therefore, we can create pmf's by defining $p_i \propto q^{[i]}p$. But if the support of X is finite then for each i greater than or equal to the cardinality of $S(X)$, the function p_i vanishes identically on $\mathbb{Z}$. Thus, it is useful to define the quantity $M = M(X)$ as follows:

$$M(X) := |S(X)| - 1 = \omega - \alpha \in \{0,1,\ldots\}\cup\{\infty\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu;q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu;\delta,\beta,\gamma)$ with pmf p and $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2n+1} < \infty$ for some $n \in \{0,1,\ldots,M(X)\}$. We consider the rv's X_i with pmf $p_i(j) = \frac{q^{[i]}(j)p(j)}{\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)}$, $j\in\mathbb{Z}$, for all $i = 0,1,2,\ldots,n$ [note that $X_i = X^*_{i-1}$, for all $i = 1,2,\ldots,n$, where $X_0 = X$]. Then:*

(a) *The rv X_i is supported on the set $S_i := S(X_i) = \{\alpha_i,\ldots,\omega_i\} = \{\alpha,\ldots,\omega-i\}$.*

(b) $X_i \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu_i;q_i)$ *where* $\mu_i = \frac{\delta i^2+\beta i+\mu}{1-2i\delta}$ *and* $q_i(j) = \frac{q(j+i)}{1-2i\delta}$.

(c) $\mathsf{Var}\,X_i = \frac{q\left(\frac{-\delta i^2+(\beta+1)i+\mu}{1-2i\delta}\right)}{1-(2i+1)\delta}$ *(for $i = n$ it is additionally required that $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2n+2} < \infty$).*

(d) $A_k = A_k(\mu;q) := \mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X) = \prod_{k=0}^{i-1}\frac{(1-2k\delta)q\left(\frac{-\delta k^2+(\beta+1)k+\mu}{1-2k\delta}\right)}{1-(2k+1)\delta}$.

(e) *The descending factorial moments of X, $\mu_{(r)} = \mathbb{E}(X)_r$, satisfy the following second order recurrence relation:*

$$\begin{aligned}[1-(r-1)\delta]\mu_{(r)} =& \{\mu+(r-1)[\beta+(2r-3)\delta-1]\}\mu_{(r-1)}\\ &+\{\gamma+(r-2)[\beta+(r-1)\delta]\}\mu_{(r-2)},\end{aligned}$$

with initial conditions $\mu_{(0)} = 1$ and $\mu_{(1)} = \mu$, for all $r = 2,3,\ldots,2n+1$.

(f) *The ascending factorial moments of X, $\mu_{[r]} = \mathbb{E}[X]_r$, satisfy the following recurrence:*

$$[1-(r-1)\delta]\mu_{[r]} = \{\mu + (r-1)[1+\beta-(r-1)\delta]\}\mu_{[r-1]} + \gamma\sum_{k=0}^{r-2}(r-1)_{r-k-1}\mu_{[k]},$$

with initial conditions $\mu_{[0]} = 1$ and $\mu_{[1]} = \mu$, for all $r = 2, 3, \ldots, 2n+1$.

Proof. (a) It is obvious by Lemma 2.1(b),(c).

(b) The proof will be done by induction on i. For $i = 1$ the result follows from Lemma 4.1. Assuming that it holds for $i-1 \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we will prove that is true for i. By assumption, $X_{i-1} \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1})$ with

$$\mu_{i-1} = \tfrac{\delta(i-1)^2+\beta(i-1)+\mu}{1-2\delta(i-1)} \text{ and } q_i(j) = \tfrac{q(j+i-1)}{1-2\delta(i-1)}.$$

From $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2n+1} < \infty$ it follows that $\mathbb{E}|X_{i-1}|^3 < \infty$. As in Lemma 4.1 we consider the rv $X^*_{i-1} \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu^*_{i-1}; q^*_{i-1})$ with

$$\mu^*_{i-1} = \tfrac{\mu_{i-1}+\beta_{i-1}+\delta_{i-1}}{1-2\delta_{i-1}} \text{ and } q^*_{i-1} = \tfrac{q_{i-1}(j+1)}{1-2\delta_{i-1}}.$$

From the inductional assumption,

$$\mu_{i-1} = \tfrac{\delta(i-1)^2+\beta(i-1)+\mu}{1-2(i-1)\delta} \text{ and } q_{i-1}(j) = \tfrac{q(j+i-1)}{1-2(i-1)\delta} \text{ (and } \delta_{i-1} = \tfrac{\delta}{1-2(i-1)\delta});$$

thus, after some algebra we get $\mu^*_{i-1} = \mu_i$ and $q^*_{i-1} = q_i$. Finally, observe that

$$p^*_{i-1}(j) = \frac{q_{i-1}(j)p_{i-1}(j)}{\mathbb{E}q_{i-1}(X_{i-1})}.$$

Since

$$q_{i-1}(j)p_{i-1}(j) = \tfrac{q^{[i]}(j)p(j)}{[1-(i-1)\delta]\mathbb{E}q^{[i-1]}(X)} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}q_{i-1}(X_{i-1}) = \tfrac{\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)}{[1-(i-1)\delta]\mathbb{E}q^{[i-1]}(X)},$$

we get $p^*_{i-1}(j) = p_i(j)$.

(c) It is immediate from (b) and (4.3).

(d) Observe that

$$(1-2j\delta)\mathsf{Var}X_j = (1-2j\delta)\mathbb{E}q_j(X_j) = \mathbb{E}q(X_j) = \frac{A_{j+1}(\mu;q)}{A_j(\mu;q)}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1,$$

where $A_0(\mu; q) := 1$, $q_0 = q$, $X_0 = X$. Multiplying these relations for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1$ and using (c), the result follows.

(e) Write $\mathbb{E}(X)_r = (\mu - r + 1)\mathbb{E}(X)_{r-1} + \mathbb{E}(X-\mu)(X)_{r-1} = (\mu - r + 1)\mathbb{E}(X)_{r-1} + \mathsf{Cov}[X, (X)_{r-1}]$. Using the covariance identity (4.1) and since $\Delta[(j)_{r-1}] = (r-1)(j)_{r-2}$, it follows that

$$\mathsf{Cov}[X, (X)_{r-1}] = \mathbb{E}q(X)\Delta[(X)_{r-1}] = (r-1)\mathbb{E}q(X)(X)_{r-2}.$$

Moreover, $q(x)(x)_{r-1} = \delta(x)_r + [\beta + (2r-3)\delta](x)_{r-1} + \{\gamma + (r-2)[\beta + (r-1)\delta]\}(x)_{r-2}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}q(X)(X)_{r-2} = \delta\mu_{(r)} + [\beta + (2r-3)\delta]\mu_{(r-1)} + \{\gamma + (r-2)[\beta + (r-1)\delta]\}\mu_{(r-2)}.$$

Combining the above relations, the result follows.

(f) Similarly to (e), $\mu_{[r]} = (\mu+r-1)\mu_{[r-1]} + \mathsf{Cov}(X, [X]_{r-1})$. Using (4.1) and the fact that $\Delta[X]_{r-1} = (r-1)[X+1]_{r-2}$, we get $\mathsf{Cov}(X, [X]_{r-1}) = (r-1)\mathbb{E}q(X)[X+1]_{r-2}$. Write

$$q(x)[x+1]_{r-2} = \delta[x]_r + [\beta - (r-1)\delta][x]_{r-1} + \gamma \sum_{k=0}^{r-2} (r-2)_{r-2-k}[x]_k.$$

Then, $\mu_{[r]} = (\mu + r - 1)\mu_{[r-1]} + (r-1)\{\delta\mu_{[r]} + [\beta - (r-1)\delta]\mu_{[r-1]} + \gamma \sum_{k=0}^{r-2}(r-2)_{r-2-k}\mu_{[k]}\}$. □

Next we generalize the results of Lemma 2.3 in CO family.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$ and assume that it has an upper (resp. lower) unbounded support and $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2i-1} < \infty$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. Then $j^{2i}p(j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$ (resp. $j \to -\infty$).*

Proof. Note that $\delta \geqslant 0$ since the support is finite if $\delta < 0$. For the case $\delta = 0$ the result is obvious, since X has finite moments of any order, see Lemma 2.2. When $\delta > 0$ then, as in Proposition 4.1, consider the rv $X_{2i-2} \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu_{2i-2}; q_{2i-2})$. From Lemma 2.3 it follows that $q_{2i-2}(j)p_{2i-2}(j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$ (resp. $j \to -\infty$) and since $\lim_{j\to\pm\infty} q_{2i-2}(j)p_{2i-2}(j) \propto \lim_{j\to\pm\infty} j^{2i}p(j)$, the proof is complete. □

5. Orthogonal polynomials in cumulative Ord family

In this section we present (new and existing) results for the orthogonal polynomials of a probability measure of the cumulative Ord family. These polynomials are obtained by a *discrete Rodrigues-type formula*.

First, we present a brief review. Hildebrandt (1931, Chap. IV, pp. 419–439) studied the nonzero solutions $u(j)$ of the Pearson difference equation,

$$\Delta u(j) = \frac{N(j)}{D(j)}u(j), \tag{5.1}$$

where the numerator N is a polynomial of degree at most one and the denominator D is a polynomial of degree at most two. He showed that the functions, produced by the Rodriguez-type formula

$$Q_n(j) = \frac{\Delta^n[D^{[n]}(j-n)u(j)]}{u(j)}, \tag{5.2}$$

are polynomials of degree at most n, see Hildebrandt (1931, Theo., p. 425); note that Hildebrandt makes use of the descending power notation, $D^{(n)}(j-1) := D(j-1)D(j-2)\cdots D(j-n) =$

$D^{[n]}(j-n)$. Also he showed several properties of these polynomials. In the sequel of this section, when we say that a function is the solution of a difference equation we will always mean a pmf solution, if exists.

In Hildebrandt's results the orthogonality of the produced polynomials was not an issue. However, these polynomials are orthogonal only when we make a correct choice of the set on which we seek for a solution, and provided that we used the correct writing of the ratio of the polynomials N and D in (5.2). Next we present some examples to illustrate this.

***Example* 5.1.** (a) Consider the difference equation $\frac{\Delta p(j)}{p(j)} = \frac{\lambda-j-1}{j+1}$, where λ is a positive constant. This difference equation is of the form (1.1) and (5.1). Of course, in order to solve a difference equation we must specify the support set on which we seek for the solution. If this set is $\mathbb{N}$ then the solution is $e^{-\lambda}\frac{\lambda^j}{j!}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$ (Poisson distribution with parameter λ). If the set is $\{0, 1, \ldots, N\}$ then the solution is $C\frac{\lambda^j}{j!}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$ (truncated Poisson distribution with parameter λ). The polynomials obtained by (5.2) are the Charlier polynomials which are orthogonal with respect to the Poisson pmf, but not with respect to the truncated Poisson pmf.

(b) Consider the pmf of the geometric distribution with parameter $p \in (0, 1)$, i.e., $p(j) = p(1-p)^j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$. This pmf satisfies the difference equation $\frac{\Delta p(j)}{p(j)} = -p$, which can be rewritten in the form (5.1) with infinitely many ways. Specifically,

$$\frac{\Delta p(j)}{p(j)} = \frac{-p(bj+a)}{bj+a}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $bj+a$ is a constant (when $b = 0$) or a linear polynomial without roots on $\mathbb{N}$. For any choice of a and b, Hildebrandt's results are valid. However, the polynomials in (5.2) are orthogonal with respect to the geometric pmf only when we make the choice $a = b \neq 0$ (Meixner polynomials).

(c) Now consider the difference equation $\frac{\Delta p(j)}{p(j)} = 0$ supported on an integer chain. Of course, if the support is infinite then it has no pmf solutions; thus we consider a finite integer chain, and without loss of generality take $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. The solution is $p(j) = \frac{1}{N}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, i.e. X is uniformly distributed on the support. The equation can be rewritten in the form (5.1) with infinitely many ways, i.e., with $N(j) = 0$ and $D(j) = cj^2 + bj + a$ any quadratic polynomial without roots on $\{1, 2, \ldots, N-1\}$. Again the polynomials in (5.2) are orthogonal with respect to pmf p only when one makes the correct choice $D(j) \propto j(N-j)$ (Hahn polynomials).

Here, we note that the equations (1.1) and (5.1) are equivalent, excluding the case $\Delta p(j) = 0$. Specifically, $\frac{\Delta p(j)}{p(j)} = \frac{N(j)}{D(j)} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\Delta p(j-1)}{p(j)} = \frac{N(j-1)}{D(j-1)+N(j-1)}$. It is also true that the denominator in (1.1), under suitable conditions, generates orthogonal polynomials with respect to the pmf solution of this equation, see Proposition 2.1; see also the next theorem.

Independently of Hildebrandt's results, Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011) studied the orthogonality of the Rodrigues polynomials in the CO family:

Theorem 5.1 (Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011, Lemma 2.3, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2))**.** *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$. For each $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ define the functions*

$P_k(j)$, $j \in S$, by the Rodrigues-type formula

$$P_k(j) = \frac{(-1)^k \Delta^k [q^{[k]}(j-k)p(j-k)]}{p(j)} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{i} q^{[k]}(j-i)p(j-i)}{p(j)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Then:

(a) *Each P_k is a polynomial of degree at most k, with*

$$\mathrm{lead}(P_k) = \prod_{j=k-1}^{2k-2} (1 - j\delta) := c_k(\delta) \tag{5.5}$$

[in the sense that the function $P_k(j)$, $j \in S$, is the restriction of a real polynomial $G_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} c(k,i)x^i$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, of degree at most k, such that $c(k,k) = \mathrm{lead}(P_k)$].

(b) *Provided that $\mathbb{E}X^{2n} < \infty$ for some $n \geqslant 1$, the polynomials P_k, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, satisfy the orthogonality condition*

$$\mathbb{E}P_k(X)P_m(X) = \delta_{k,m} c_k(\delta) \mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X) = \delta_{k,m} c_k(\delta) A_k(\mu; q), \quad k, m = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\delta_{k,m}$ is Kronecker's delta.

(c) *Provided that $k \geqslant 1$ and $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2k-1} < \infty$, the following "Rodrigues inversion formula" holds:*

$$q^{[k]}(j)p(j) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sum_{i>j} (i - j - 1)_{k-1} P_k(i)p(i). \tag{5.7}$$

***Remark* 5.1.** (a) In (5.4) when $k > M$ we have $\mathbb{E}P_k^2(X) = 0$, since the polynomial $q^{[k]}$ vanishes identically on S. Thus, in the sequel we study the polynomials P_k only when $k \leqslant M$.

(b) Provided that $\mathbb{E}X^{2k} < \infty$ and $k \leqslant M$, the quantities $1 - j\delta$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, 2k-2$, are strictly positive. If $\delta \leqslant 0$ this is obvious. If $\delta > 0$ and S is infinite this follows from Lemma 2.2, while if S is finite this follows from Remark 2.2. Thus, the quantity $\prod_{j=k-1}^{2k-2}(1 - j\delta)$ is strictly positive. Also, since the polynomial $q^{[k]}$ is non-negative on S and $\mathbb{P}[q^{[k]}(X) > 0] > 0$ it follows that $0 < \mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X) < \infty$.

For a non-negative integer n such that $n \leqslant M$ and $\mathbb{E}X^{2n}$, Remark 5.1(b) shows that we can define the standardized Rodrigues polynomials,

$$\phi_k(j) = \frac{P_k(j)}{(k! c_k(\delta) \mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X))^{1/2}}, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{5.8}$$

The set $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{n} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ is an orthonormal basis of all polynomials with degree at most n. Moreover, (5.5) shows that the leading coefficient is given by

$$\mathrm{lead}(\phi_k) := d_k(\mu; q) = \left(\frac{c_k(\delta)}{k! A_k(\mu; q)} \right)^{1/2} > 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{5.9}$$

Let X be any random variable of the CO family with $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2n} < \infty$, where n is less than the cardinality of the support of X. It is well known that we can always construct an orthonormal set of real polynomials up to order n. This construction is based on the first $2n$ moments of X and is a by-product of the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization process, applied to the linearly independent system $\{1, x, x^2, \ldots, x^n\} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$. The orthonormal polynomials are then uniquely defined, apart from the fact that we can multiply each polynomial by ± 1. It follows that the standardized Rodrigues polynomials ϕ_k of (5.8) are the unique orthonormal polynomials that can be defined for a pmf $p \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$, provided that $\mathrm{lead}(\phi_k) > 0$. Therefore, it is useful to express the L^2-norm of each P_k in terms of the parameters δ, β, γ and μ. This result is given by (5.6) and Proposition 4.1(d).

Consider the rv's X_i with pmf's p_i as defined in Proposition 4.1. From (5.4), the corresponding Rodrigues polynomials are given by

$$P_{k,i}(j) = \frac{(-1)^k \Delta^k [q_i^{[k]}(j-k) p_i(j-k)]}{p_i(j)}. \tag{5.10}$$

Thus, the standardized Rodrigues polynomials, orthonormal with respect to the pmf of X_i, are given by

$$\phi_{k,i}(j) = \frac{P_{k,i}(j)}{(k! c_k(\delta_i) A_k(\mu_i; q_i))^{1/2}}. \tag{5.11}$$

Note that for $i = 1$ the rv X_1 is denoted by X^* ($p_1 \equiv p^*$ ect.). Therefore, we may denote the polynomial $P_{k,1}$ by P_k^* and the standardized polynomial $\phi_{k,1}$ by ϕ_k^*. An important observation is that the forward difference of ϕ_k is scalar multiple of ϕ_{k-1}^*; specifically, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *If $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$ and $\mathbb{E}X^{2n} < \infty$ for some $1 \leqslant n \leqslant M$ then the polynomials ϕ_k of (5.8) and $\phi_{k,1} \equiv \phi_k^*$ of (5.11) are related through*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta\phi_k(j) = \nu_{k-1}\phi_{k-1}^*(j), \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \\ &\text{where } \nu_{k-1} = \nu_{k-1}(\mu; q) := \left(\frac{k[1-(k-1)\delta]}{A_1(\mu; q)}\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. First we show that for $1 \leqslant m < k \leqslant n$, $\mathbb{E}\Delta\phi_k(X^*)\Delta\phi_m(X^*) = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta\phi_k(j)\Delta\phi_m(j)]q(j)p(j) = \Delta[\phi_k(j)[\Delta\phi_m(j-1)]q(j-1)p(j-1)] \\ - \phi_k(j)\pi_m(j)p(j), \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

where $\pi_m(j) := [\Delta^2\phi_m(j-1)]q(j) + [\Delta\phi_m(j-1)](\mu - j)$ is a polynomial with $\deg(\pi_m) \leqslant m$. Summing (5.13) for $j = \alpha, \alpha+1, \ldots, \omega$ we observe the following: The lhs is $\mathbb{E}\Delta\phi_k(X^*)\Delta\phi_m(X^*) \times \mathbb{E}q(X)$. The first part of the rhs is $\phi_k(j)[\Delta\phi_m(j-1)]q(j-1)p(j-1)\big|_{\alpha}^{\omega+1} = 0$ (for finite α, ω this follows from $p(\alpha - 1) = q(\omega) = 0$; for infinite α, ω it follows from Proposition 4.2. The second part of the rhs is $\mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)\pi_m(X) = 0$, because ϕ_k is orthogonal to any polynomial of degree less than k. From the moment conditions it is obvious that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta\phi_k(X^*)]^2 < \infty$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta\phi_k(X^*)]^2 > 0$. The polynomial $\Delta\phi_k(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, is not identically zero, since $\mathrm{lead}(\Delta\phi_k) =$

$k\,\mathrm{lead}(\phi_k) > 0$, and can not vanish identically on the support of X^*, since $\deg(\Delta\phi_k) = k-1$ is less than the cardinality of the support of X^*.
Finally, since $\deg(\Delta\phi_k) = \deg(\phi_k^*) = k-1$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, the uniqueness of the orthogonal polynomial system implies that there exist constants $\nu_k \neq 0$ such that $\Delta\phi_k = \nu_{k-1}\phi_{k-1}^*$. Equating the leading coefficients we obtain $\mathrm{lead}(\Delta\phi_k) = \nu_{k-1}\,\mathrm{lead}(\phi_{k-1}^*)$, that is,

$$\nu_{k-1} = \frac{\mathrm{lead}(\Delta\phi_k)}{\mathrm{lead}(\phi_{k-1}^*)} = \frac{k\,\mathrm{lead}(\phi_k)}{\mathrm{lead}(\phi_{k-1}^*)} = k\sqrt{\frac{(k-1)!c_k(\delta)A_{k-1}(\mu^*;q^*)}{k!c_{k-1}(\delta^*)A_k(\mu;q)}},$$

see (5.9). Moreover, one can easily see that $c_k(\delta) = [1-(k-1)\delta](1-2\delta)^{k-1}c_{k-1}(\delta^*)$ and $A_k(\mu;q) = (1-2\delta)^{k-1}A_1(\mu;q)A_{k-1}(\mu^*;q^*)$. Thus, $\nu_{k-1} = \left(\frac{k[1-(k-1)\delta]}{A_1(\mu;q)}\right)^{1/2}$ which completes the proof. □

Applying Lemma 5.1 inductively it is easy to verify the following result.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu;q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu;\delta,\beta,\gamma)$ and assume that $\mathbb{E}X^{2n} < \infty$ for some integer n with $1 \leqslant n \leqslant M$. Then,*

$$\Delta^m\phi_k(j) = \nu_{k-m}^{(m)}\phi_{k-m,m}(j), \quad m = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad k = m, m+1, \ldots, n,$$
$$\text{with } \nu_{k-m}^{(m)} = \nu_{k-m}^{(m)}(\mu;q) := \left(\frac{k!\prod_{j=k-1}^{k+m-2}(1-j\delta)}{(k-m)!A_m(\mu;q)}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{5.14}$$

where the polynomials ϕ_k, $\phi_{k-m,m}$ are given by (5.8), (5.11) *respectively.*

Proof. The proof follows by induction on m. For $m = 0$ the result is obvious, noting that $\phi_{k,0} = \phi_k$ and $\nu_{k,0}^{(0)} = 1$. For $m = 1$ the result follows by Lemma 5.1, since $\phi_{k,1} = \phi_k^*$ and $\nu_{k,1}^{(1)} = \nu_k$. Assuming that it is true for $m-1 \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we will show that it holds for m. By the inductional assumption,

$$\Delta^{m-1}\phi_k(j) = \nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\phi_{k-m+1,m-1}(j), \quad \nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)} = \left(\frac{k!\prod_{j=k-1}^{k+m-3}(1-j\delta)}{(k-m+1)!A_{m-1}(\mu;q)}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Also, applying Lemma 5.1 for $X_{m-1} \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^m\phi_k(j) &= \Delta[\Delta^{m-1}\phi_k(j)] = \nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\Delta[\phi_{k-m+1,m-1}(j)] \\ &= \nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\nu_{k-m}(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1})\phi_{k-m,m-1}^*(j) = \nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\nu_{k-m}(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1})\phi_{k-m,m}(j),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\nu_{k-m}(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1}) = \sqrt{\frac{k!\prod_{j=k-1}^{k+m-3}(1-j\delta)}{(k-m+1)!A_{m-1}(\mu;q)} \times \frac{(k-m+1)[1-(k-m)\delta_{m-1}]}{A_1(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1})}};$$

see (5.12). Finally, it is easily to see that $A_1(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1}) = \frac{A_m(\mu;q)}{[1-2(m-1)\delta]A_{m-1}(\mu;q)}$ and

$$1-(k-m)\delta_{m-1} = \frac{1-(k-2m-2)\delta}{1-2(m-1)\delta}.$$

Thus, $\nu_{k-m+1}^{(m-1)}\nu_{k-m}(\mu_{m-1};q_{m-1}) = \nu_{k-m}^{(m)}$ and the proof is complete. □

6. L^2 completeness and expansions

We now study the Fourier coefficients of a function regarding its expansion in the L^2 Hilbert space. First we present the following basic (known) result.

Theorem 6.1 (Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011, Theorem 2.2))**.** *Suppose that* $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q)$ *and assume that* $\mathbb{E}X^{2k} < \infty$ *for some* $k \geqslant 1$. *If* g *is a function defined on* S *with* $\mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X)|\Delta^k g(X)| < \infty$ *then* $\mathbb{E}|P_k(X)g(X)| < \infty$ *and the following covariance identity holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}P_k(X)g(X) = \mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X)\Delta^k g(X). \tag{6.1}$$

Note that if the support S has a finite upper end-point, $\omega < \infty$, then $\Delta^k g(j)$, $j \in S$, may depend on some values $\{g(j),\ j \notin S\}$; however, only the values $\{j :\ j \in S,\ j \leqslant \omega - k\}$ are irrelevant in the covariance identity. This is so because for $j > \omega - k$, the ascending power $q^{[k]}(j)$ includes the factor $q(\omega) = 0$. Thus, assuming any values for $g(j)$ when j lies in the set $\{\omega + 1, \omega + 2, \ldots\}$, e.g. $g(j) = 0$, $j = \omega + 1, \omega + 2, \ldots$, will not affect the covariance identity. For any function g defined on S, the function $\Delta^k g$ has domain the set S_k, see Proposition 4.1(a). Thus, the values $\Delta^k g(j)$, $j \in S \setminus S_k$ (if exist), which appear in the formula, are immaterial.
Note that if S is finite and $k > M(X)$, then both polynomials P_k and $q^{[k]}$ are identically zero on S, and the relation (6.1) takes the trivial form $0 = 0$.
It is important to note that the identity (6.1), combined with (5.8), enables a convenient calculation of the Fourier coefficient $\alpha_k = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X)$ of a function g. Specifically,

$$\alpha_k = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X) = \frac{\mathbb{E}q^{[k]}(X)\Delta^k g(X)}{\left(k!c_k(\delta)A_k(\mu; q)\right)^{1/2}}. \tag{6.2}$$

The rhs shows that we do not need to know the polynomial ϕ_k in order to calculate α_k.

Now we give some light on the interrelations among the spaces $L^2(X_i)$ and $L^1(X_i)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let the rv's* X *and* X^* *be as in Lemma 4.1. Assume that the function* g *is defined on the support of* X. *Then,*

(a) $\Delta g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X^*) \Rightarrow g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$,

(b) $\Delta g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, X^*) \Rightarrow g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, X)$.

Proof. (a) If $|S| < \infty$ then the result is obvious. Thus, assume that $|S| = \infty$ and consider a function g such that $\Delta g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X^*)$. It suffices to show that for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sum_{j=m}^{\infty} g^2(j)p(j) < \infty, \quad \text{when } \omega = \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=-\infty}^{m} g^2(j)p(j) < \infty, \quad \text{when } \alpha = -\infty. \tag{6.3}$$

For the first inequality in (6.3) it suffices to show that $\Sigma_1(m) := \sum_{j=m}^{\infty} [g(j) - g(m)]^2 p(j) < \infty$. Let $m = [\mu] + 1 > \mu$. Then,

$$\Sigma_1(m) = \sum_{j=m}^{\infty} p(j) \left[\sum_{i=m}^{j-1} \Delta g(i) \right]^2 \leqslant \sum_{j=m}^{\infty} p(j)(j-m) \sum_{i=m}^{j-1} [\Delta g(i)]^2$$
$$= \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} [\Delta g(i)]^2 \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} (j-m)p(j) \leqslant \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} [\Delta g(i)]^2 \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} (j-\mu)p(j).$$

Since $\sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty}(j-\mu)p(j) = q(i)p(i)$,

$$\Sigma_1(m) \leqslant \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} [\Delta g(i)]^2 q(i)p(i) \leqslant \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} [\Delta g(i)]^2 q(i)p(i) = \mathbb{E}q(X)\mathbb{E}[\Delta g(X^*)]^2 < \infty.$$

For the second inequality in (6.3) we use the same arguments with $m = [\mu] \leqslant \mu$.

(b) Let $\Delta g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, X^*)$. Then, $\mathbb{E}q(X)|\Delta g(X|) = \mathbb{E}q(X)\mathbb{E}|\Delta g(X^*)| < \infty$. Applying Theorem 6.1 for $k = 1$, and since $P_1(j) = j - \mu$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}|P_1(X)g(X)| = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |(j-\mu)g(j)|p(j)$ is finite. Thus,

$$\sum_{j>[\mu]+1} |g(j)|p(j) \leqslant \sum_{j>[\mu]+1} |(j-\mu)g(j)|p(j) < \infty \quad \text{and}$$
$$\sum_{j\leqslant[\mu]-1} |g(j)|p(j) \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant[\mu]-1} |(j-\mu)g(j)|p(j) < \infty,$$

which completes the proof. □

Corollary 6.1. *Let the rv's X and X_i, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ be as in Proposition 4.1 and consider a function g defined on the support of X. Then,*

(a) $\Delta^n g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_n) \Rightarrow \Delta^i g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$ *for every* $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

(b) $\Delta^n g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, X_n) \Rightarrow \Delta^i g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$ *for every* $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

Proof. Immediate application of Lemma 6.1. □

It is known (due to M. Riesz) that the real polynomials are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ whenever the probability measure of X is determined by its moments; see Riesz (1923); Akhiezer (1965). An even simpler sufficient condition is when X has a finite moment generating function at a neighborhood of zero, that is, when there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$M_X(t) = \mathbb{E}e^{tX} < \infty, \quad t \in (-t_0, t_0), \tag{6.4}$$

see Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011), cf. Berg and Christensen (1981).
Consider an rv X in the CO family. If the support of X is finite then (6.4) holds, and the real polynomials are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$; in this case $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X) = \text{span}\{1, x, x^2, \ldots, x^M\}$, and the system

of polynomials $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{M}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$. When X has infinite support then there are two possibilities: If $\delta > 0$ then X has not finite moments of any order, see Lemma 2.2, and the real polynomials are not dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$. If $\delta \leqslant 0$ then (6.4) holds, see Section 3 or Table 3.2, so the real polynomials are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ and the system of polynomials $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of this space. From the above observations, it is natural to define the following subclass of random variables of the CO system:

$$C = \{X : X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma) \text{ for some } (\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma), \text{ and } \delta \leqslant 0 \text{ or } |S(X)| < \infty\}. \tag{6.5}$$

***Remark* 6.1.** Let $X \in C$. Then,

(a) The set of polynomials $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{M}$ (M is finite or infinite) is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$. Thus, any function $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ can be expanded as

$$g(j) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{M} \alpha_k \phi_k(j), \tag{6.6}$$

where $\alpha_k = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X)$ are the Fourier coefficients of g. The series converges in the norm of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$; that is, $\mathbb{E}[g(X) - \sum_{k=0}^{M} \alpha_k \phi_k(X)]^2 = 0$ (when $M < \infty$) or $\mathbb{E}[g(X) - \sum_{k=0}^{N} \alpha_k \phi_k(X)]^2 \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ (when $M = \infty$). Parseval's identity shows that

$$\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} \alpha_k^2, \quad g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X). \tag{6.7}$$

(b) For every $i = 0, 1, \ldots, M$, $X_i \in C$ (see Proposition 4.1), and the corresponding results of (a) hold for each X_i.

One can apply i times the forward difference operator in the series (6.6) to get, in view of Theorem 5.2, the formal expansion

$$\Delta^i g(j) \sim \sum_{k=i}^{M} \alpha_k \Delta^i \phi_k(j) = \sum_{k=i}^{M} v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q) \alpha_k \phi_{k-i,i}(j), \tag{6.8}$$

where $v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q)$ and $\{\phi_{k-i,i}(j)\}_{k=i}^{M}$ are given by (5.14) and (5.11), respectively. Now, if the expansion (6.8) was indeed correct in the $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$-sense, then the completeness of the system $\{\phi_{k,i}\}_{k=0}^{M_i}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$ would lead to the corresponding Parseval identity,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)(\Delta^i g(X))^2}{\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)} = \mathbb{E}(\Delta^i g(X_i))^2 = \sum_{k=i}^{M} [v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q)]^2 \alpha_k^2. \tag{6.9}$$

Finally, from (5.14) we have $[v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q)]^2 = \frac{k! \prod_{j=k-1}^{k+i-2}(1-j\delta)}{(k-i)!\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)}$. A combination of the last equation with (6.9) yields the important identity

$$\mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)(\Delta^i g(X))^2 = \sum_{k=i}^{M} \frac{k! \prod_{j=k-1}^{k+i-2}(1 - j\delta)}{(k-i)!} \alpha_k^2. \tag{6.10}$$

This should be correct for all g such that $\Delta^i g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$, provided that expansion (6.6) is valid. We shall show that this is indeed the case. The L^2 convergence of $\sum_{k=0}^{N} \alpha_k \phi_k(X)$ to $g(X)$ implies that $g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{M} \alpha_k \phi_k(X)$ with probability 1, that is $g(j) = \sum_{k=0}^{M} \alpha_k \phi_k(j)$ for all $j \in S(X)$. Therefore, $\Delta^i g(j) = \sum_{k=0}^{M} \alpha_k \Delta^i \phi_k(j) = \sum_{k=i}^{M} v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q) \alpha_k \phi_{k-i,i}(j)$ for all $j \in S(X_i)$.

However, the same results can be derived via an alternative technique, similar to the one given in Afendras and Papadatos (2013). In fact, we shall show more, namely, that an initial segment of the Fourier coefficients for the i-th difference of g, suggested by (6.8), can be derived for any $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$ having a sufficient number of moments. This result holds even if $\delta > 0$ and $|S| = \infty$. We present this technique because Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 6.2 may have some interest in themselves.

Lemma 6.2. *Consider a non-negative sequence $\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and assume that there is a positive integer n such that $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} |i|^n a_i$ is finite. For each $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ we define the sequence $\{b_{j;k}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ by the relation*

$$b_{j;k} := \sum_{i \geqslant j} [j - i]_k a_i.$$

Then,

(a) *For every $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $\Delta b_{j;k} = k b_{j+1;k-1}$, where the forward difference is taken with respect to the index j.*

(b) $\Delta^r b_{j;n} = (n)_r b_{j+r;n-r}$ *for each $r \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. In particular, for $r = n$,*

$$\Delta^n b_{j;n} = n! b_{j+n;0} = n! \sum_{i \geqslant j+n} a_i. \tag{6.11}$$

Proof. (a) $\Delta b_{j;k} = \sum_{i\geqslant j+1} [j + 1 - i]_k a_i - \sum_{i\geqslant j} [j - i]_k a_i = \sum_{i\geqslant j+1} \Delta[j - i]_k a_i - [0]_k$. Since $[0]_k = 0$ $(k > 0)$ and $\Delta[j - i]_k = k[j + 1 - i]_{k-1}$, the desired result follows.

(b) It follows easily by applying (a) r times inductively. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$ and consider a positive integer $k \leqslant M$. Then, provided that $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2k-1}$ is finite,*

$$q(j)p(j)\Delta P_k(j) = -\lambda_k(\delta) \sum_{i \leqslant j} P_k(i)p(i) = \lambda_k(\delta) \sum_{i > j} P_k(i)p(i), \tag{6.12}$$

where $\lambda_k(\delta) := k[1 - (k - 1)\delta]$ and P_k is the orthogonal polynomial given by (5.4). If, in addition, $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2k}$ is finite, then for the standardized polynomial $\phi_k = P_k / \sqrt{\mathbb{E}P_k^2(X)}$ we have

$$q(j)p(j)\Delta\phi_k(j) = -\lambda_k(\delta) \sum_{i \leqslant j} \phi_k(i)p(i) = \lambda_k(\delta) \sum_{i > j} \phi_k(i)p(i). \tag{6.13}$$

Proof. Since $(x)_n = (-1)^n[-x]_n$, we can apply (5.7) (replacing j with $j-(k-1)$) to obtain

$$q^{[k]}(j-(k-1))p(j-(k-1)) = \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}\sum_{i\geqslant j-k+2}[j-i-k-2]_{k-1}P_k(i)p(i). \tag{6.14}$$

The lhs can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} q^{[k]}(j-(k-1))p(j-(k-1)) &= q^{[k-1]}(j-(k-1)+1)q(j-(k-1))p(j-(k-1)) \\ &= (1-2\delta)^{k-1}q_1^{[k-1]}(j-(k-1))p_1(j-(k-1))\mathbb{E}q(X). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying the operator Δ^{k-1} and using (5.10), we obtain

$$(-1)^{k-1}(1-2\delta)^{k-1}p_1(j)P_{k-1,1}(j)\mathbb{E}q(X) = (-1)^{k-1}(1-2\delta)^{k-1}q(j)p(j)P_{k-1,1}(j).$$

Observe that, as in Lemma 5.1, $\Delta P_k(j) = B_{k-1}P_{k-1,1}(j)$ where $B_{k-1} = \frac{\operatorname{lead}(\Delta P_k)}{\operatorname{lead}(P_{k-1,1})} = \frac{k\operatorname{lead}(P_k)}{\operatorname{lead}(P_{k-1,1})} = \frac{kc_k(\delta)}{c_{k-1}(\delta_1)} = k[1-(k-1)\delta](1-2\delta)^{k-1}$. Therefore, an application of the operator Δ^{k-1} to the lhs of (6.14) produces the quantity

$$\frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{\lambda_k(\delta)}q(j)p(j)\Delta P_k(j).$$

Also, applying the operator Δ^{k-1} to the rhs of (6.14) and using Lemma 6.2 we arrive at the quantity $(-1)^{k-1}\sum_{i>j}P_k(i)p(i)$, and the result follows from the fact that the last two quantities must be equal to each other. Finally, since $\mathbb{E}P_k(X) = 0$ (because $k \geqslant 1$), we conclude that $(-1)^{k-1}\sum_{i>j}P_k(i)p(i) = (-1)^k\sum_{i\leqslant j}P_k(i)p(i)$ and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 6.4. *Let the rv's X and X^* be as in Lemma 4.1, and assume that for some integer k with $1 \leqslant k \leqslant M$, $\mathbb{E}|X|^{\max\{2k,3\}} < \infty$. Then, for any function g with $\Delta g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X^*)$, we have the identity*

$$\mathbb{E}\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*) = \nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X), \tag{6.15}$$

where ϕ_k, $\phi_{k,1} \equiv \phi^*_k$ and $\nu_{k-1} = \nu_{k-1}(\mu;q)$ are given by (5.8), (5.11) and (5.12) respectively.

Proof. By the assumption, the Fourier coefficient of Δg with respect to ϕ^*_{k-1}, $\mathbb{E}\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*)$, is well-defined (and finite):

$$\mathbb{E}^2|\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*)| \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)]^2\mathbb{E}[\Delta g(X^*)]^2 = \mathbb{E}[\Delta g(X^*)]^2 < \infty.$$

From Corollary 6.1 it follows that $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ and, similarly, $\mathbb{E}|\phi_k(X)g(X)| < \infty$.
Since $\mathbb{E}\phi_k(X) = 0$, ϕ_k must changes its sing in the support of X. Thus, ϕ_k has real roots, say $\rho_1 < \cdots < \rho_m$, that lie into the interval $\mathbb{R}\cap[\alpha,\omega]$. Fix now an integer $\rho \in \{[\rho_1],\ldots,[\rho_m]\} \subset S$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}q(X)}\sum_{j=\alpha}^{\omega-1}\Delta g(j)q(j)p(j)\phi^*_{k-1}(j) = \frac{1}{\nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}q(X)}\sum_{j=\alpha}^{\omega-1}\Delta g(j)q(j)p(j)\Delta\phi_k(j) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda_k(\delta)}{\nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}q(X)}\sum_{j=\alpha}^{\rho-1}\Delta g(j)\sum_{i=\alpha}^{j}p(i)\phi_k(i) + \frac{\lambda_k(\delta)}{\nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}q(X)}\sum_{j=\rho}^{\omega-1}\Delta g(j)\sum_{i=j+1}^{\omega}p(i)\phi_k(i). \end{aligned}$$

Observing that $\frac{\lambda_k(\delta)}{\nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}q(X)} = \nu_{k-1}$, the preceding equation can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*) = \nu_{k-1}(\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1), \quad \text{where} \tag{6.16}$$

$$\Sigma_1 := \sum_{j=\alpha}^{\rho-1} \Delta g(j) \sum_{i=\alpha}^{j} p(i)\phi_k(i), \quad \Sigma_2 := \sum_{j=\rho}^{\omega-1} \Delta g(j) \sum_{i=j+1}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i). \tag{6.17}$$

Now, we wish to change the order of summation to both sums Σ_1 and Σ_2. To this end, for Σ_2 it suffices to show that

$$\Sigma^*_2 := \sum_{j=\rho}^{\omega-1} |\Delta g(j)| \sum_{i=j+1}^{\omega} p(i)|\phi_k(i)| < \infty. \tag{6.18}$$

Similarly, for Σ_1 it suffices to show that $\Sigma^*_1 := \sum_{j=\alpha}^{\rho-1} |\Delta g(j)| \sum_{i=\alpha}^{j} p(i)|\phi_k(i)| < \infty$. Note that, obviously, if $\alpha > -\infty$ then $\Sigma^*_1 < \infty$ and if $\omega < \infty$ then $\Sigma^*_2 < \infty$. We now proceed to verify (6.18) when $\omega = \infty$. Write $\Sigma^*_2 = \Sigma^*_{21} + \Sigma^*_{22}$ where

$$\Sigma^*_{21} := \sum_{j=\rho}^{[\rho_m]} |\Delta g(j)| \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} p(i)|\phi_k(i)|, \quad \Sigma^*_{22} := \sum_{j=[\rho_m]+1}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)| \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} p(i)|\phi_k(i)|.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}|X|^k < \infty$, $\sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} p(i)|\phi_k(i)| < \infty$ for each $j = \rho, \ldots, [\rho_m]$ and thus, $\Sigma^*_{21} < \infty$, being a finite sum of finite terms. On the other hand, since the polynomial ϕ_k does not chain its sign in the set $\{[\rho_m] + 1, [\rho_m] + 2, \ldots\}$, we can define the constant π as

$$\pi := \operatorname{sign}\phi_k(j) \in \{-1, 1\}, \quad j \in \{[\rho_m] + 1, [\rho_m] + 2, \ldots\}.$$

Then, $\pi\phi_k(j) = |\phi_k(j)|$ holds for all $j \in \{[\rho_m] + 1, [\rho_m] + 2, \ldots\}$ and from (6.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma^*_{22} &= \pi \sum_{j=[\rho_m]+1}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)| \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} p(i)\phi_k(i) = \frac{\pi}{\lambda_k(\delta)} \sum_{j=[\rho_m]+1}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)|q(j)p(j)\Delta\phi_k(j) \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda_k(\delta)} \sum_{j=[\rho_m]+1}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)|q(j)p(j)|\Delta\phi_k(j)| \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda_k(\delta)} \sum_{j=\alpha}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)|q(j)p(j)|\Delta\phi_k(j)| \\
&= \frac{\nu_{k-1}\mathbb{E}q(X)}{\lambda_k(\delta)} \sum_{j=\alpha}^{\infty} |\Delta g(j)\phi^*_{k-1}(j)|p_1(j) = \frac{1}{\nu_{k-1}}\mathbb{E}|\phi^*_{k-1}(X^*)\Delta g(X^*)| < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (6.18) follows for both cases ($\omega < \infty$ or $\omega = \infty$). If $\alpha = -\infty$ using similar arguments it is shown that $\Sigma^*_1 < \infty$.

Thus, we can indeed interchange the order of summation to both sums Σ_1 and Σ_2 of (6.17). It follows that

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\rho-1} p(i)\phi_k(i) \sum_{j=i}^{\rho-1} \Delta g(j) = g(\rho) \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\rho-1} p(i)\phi_k(i) - \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\rho-1} g(i)p(i)\phi_k(i),$$

$$\Sigma_2 = \sum_{i=\rho+1}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i) \sum_{j=\rho}^{i-1} \Delta g(j) = \sum_{i=\rho+1}^{\omega} g(i)p(i)\phi_k(i) - g(\rho) \sum_{i=\rho+1}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i)$$
$$= \sum_{i=\rho}^{\omega} g(i)p(i)\phi_k(i) - g(\rho) \sum_{i=\rho}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i).$$

Taking into account the fact that $\sum_{\alpha}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i) = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X) = 0$, we get

$$\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1 = \sum_{\alpha}^{\omega} g(i)p(i)\phi_k(i) - g(\rho) \sum_{\alpha}^{\omega} p(i)\phi_k(i) = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X),$$

which completes the proof. □

Theorem 6.2. *Let $X \sim \mathrm{CO}(\mu; q) = \mathrm{CO}(\mu; \delta, \beta, \gamma)$ and fix an integer k with $1 \leqslant k \leqslant M$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2k+1} < \infty$ and consider the rv's X_i, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, as in Proposition 4.1. Then,*

(a) *the Fourier coefficients satisfy the relation*

$$\mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i,i}(X_i)\Delta^i g(X_i) = v_{k-i}^{(i)} \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X), \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, k, \tag{6.19}$$

where ϕ_k, $\phi_{k,i}$ and $v_{k-i}^{(i)} = v_{k-i}^{(i)}(\mu; q)$ are given by (5.8), (5.11) and (5.14) respectively.

(b) *If, in addition, $X \in C$ and $\Delta^n g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_n)$ for some fixed integer n with $1 \leqslant n \leqslant M$ then (6.10) holds for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.*

Proof. (a) By Corollary 6.1, $\Delta^i g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. (6.19) for $i = 0$ is obvious and for $i = 1$ it follows from Lemma 6.4. Assume that it is true for $i - 1 \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\}$, that is,

$$\mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i+1,i-1}(X_{i-1})\Delta^{i-1} g(X_{i-1}) = v_{k-i+1}^{(i-1)} \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X).$$

Observe that the assumptions of Lemma 6.4 are satisfied for the rv X_{i-1}, the integer $k - i + 1$ and the function $\Delta^{i-1}g$. Using (6.15) we get

$$\mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i,i}(X_i)\Delta^i g(X_i) = \mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i,i}(X_i)\Delta(\Delta^{i-1} g(X_i))$$
$$= v_{k-i}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1})\mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i+1,i-1}(X_{i-1})\Delta^{i-1} g(X_{i-1}).$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\phi_{k-i,i}(X_i)\Delta^i g(X_i) = v_{k-i}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1}) v_{k-i+1}^{(i-1)} \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X)g(X).$$

Finally, $v_{k-i}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1}) = \left(\frac{(k-i+1)[1-(k-i)\delta_{i-1}]}{A_1(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1})}\right)^{1/2}$ where $A_1(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1}) = \frac{A_i(\mu;q)}{[1-2(i-1)\delta]A_{i-1}(\mu;q)}$ and $1-(k-i)\delta_{i-1} = \frac{1-(k+i-2)\delta}{1-2(i-1)\delta}$. So,

$$v_{k-i}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1}) = \left(\frac{(k-i+1)[1-(k+i-2)\delta]A_{i-1}(\mu; q)}{A_i(\mu; q)}\right)^{1/2}$$

and a straightforward calculation shows that $v_{k-i}(\mu_{i-1}; q_{i-1}) v_{k-i+1}^{(i-1)} = v_{k-i}^{(i)}$.

(b) Since $X \in C$ we have that $X_i \in C$ and the set of polynomials $\{\phi_{k,i}\}_{k=0}^{M_i}$ (where $M_i = M(X_i) = M - i$) is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$, see Remark 6.1(b). Moreover, $\Delta^i g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, X_i)$. Thus, by Parseval's identity it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta^i g(X_i)]^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{M_i} \alpha_{k,i}^2 = \sum_{k=i}^{M} \alpha_{k-i,i}^2,$$

where $\alpha_{k,i}^2 := \mathbb{E}\phi_{k,i}(X_i)\Delta^i g(X_i)$ (with $\alpha_{k,0} = \alpha_k$) is the Fourier coefficient of $\Delta^i g$ with respect to $\phi_{k,i}$. Using (6.19), $\alpha_{k-i,i}^2 = \mathbb{E}^2\phi_{k-i,i}(X_i)\Delta^i g(X_i) = [v_{k-i}^{(i)}]^2\mathbb{E}^2\phi_k(X)g(X) = [v_{k-i}^{(i)}]^2\alpha_k^2$, which verifies (6.9) and the proof is complete. □

7. Applications to variance bounds

Here we use the results of Section 6 and we present a wide class of variance bounds for a function g of a random variable X in the CO family.

Let X be any rv in the CO family and consider two non-negative integers $m, n \leqslant M$ such that $\mathbb{E}X^{2\ell} < \infty$, where $\ell = \max\{m, n\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{H}^{m,n}(X)$ the class of functions $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$ ($S = S(X)$ is the support of X) defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)(\Delta^n g(X))^2 < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}q^{[m]}(X)|\Delta^m g(X)| < \infty. \tag{7.1}$$

From Corollary 6.1 and the fact that $\mathbb{E}^2 q^{[i]}(X)|\Delta^i g(X)| \leqslant \mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X) \cdot \mathbb{E}q^{[i]}(X)(\Delta^i g(X))^2$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, we conclude the following:

$$\text{If } m \leqslant n \text{ and if } \mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)(\Delta^n g(X))^2 < \infty \text{ then } \mathbb{E}q^{[m]}(X)|\Delta^m g(X)| < \infty.$$

Note that Corollary 6.1 requires $\mathbb{E}|X|^{2\ell+1} < \infty$, but this assumption is needed only for the existence of the pmf p_ℓ; thus, for the validity of the above observation it is sufficient that $\mathbb{E}X^{2\ell} < \infty$. It follows that $\mathcal{H}^{0,n} = \mathcal{H}^{1,n} = \cdots = \mathcal{H}^{n,n}$ [of course, $\mathcal{H}^{0,0}(X) = L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$].

Furthermore, when $M = \infty$ and X has finite moments of any order (that is, $\delta \leqslant 0$) we shall denote by $\mathcal{H}^{\infty,n}(X)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(X)$ the classes $\mathcal{H}^{\infty,n}(X) := \cap_{m=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{H}^{m,n}(X) = \cap_{m=n+1}^{\infty}\mathcal{H}^{m,n}(X)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(X) := \cap_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{H}^{\infty,n}(X)$. That is,

$$\mathcal{H}^{\infty,n}(X) = \{g : \mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)(\Delta^n g(X))^2 < \infty \text{ and } \mathbb{E}q^{[m]}(X)|\Delta^m g(X)| < \infty \ \forall m > n\},$$
$$\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(X) = \{g : \mathbb{E}q^{[n]}(X)(\Delta^n g(X))^2 < \infty \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Note that, by definition, $\mathcal{H}^{m,\infty}(X) := \cap_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{H}^{m,n} \equiv \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(X)$ for arbitrary fixed m.

From Corollary 6.1 we conclude that the (finite or infinite) sequence $\mathcal{H}^{m,n}(X)$ is decreasing in

both m and n. In particular, if all moments of X exist then

$$
\begin{array}{lccccccc}
L^2(\mathbb{R}, X) \equiv & \mathcal{H}^{0,0}(X) & & & & & & \\
& \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & & & & & \\
& \mathcal{H}^{1,0}(X) & \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{1,1}(X) & & & & \\
& \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & & & \\
& \mathcal{H}^{2,0}(X) & \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{2,1}(X) & \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{2,2}(X) & & \\
& \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \\
& \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
& \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\subseteq$} & & \\
& \mathcal{H}^{M,0}(X) & \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{M,1}(X) & \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{M,2}(X) & \supseteq \cdots \supseteq & \mathcal{H}^{M,M}(X).
\end{array}
$$

The equations (6.1) and (6.10) are almost identical with those given in Afendras (2013, eq's (2.3) and (2.2)), for the continuous case. Therefore, using similar arguments, the next theorem holds; cf. Afendras (2013, Theo. 2.1).

Theorem 7.1. *Let $X \in C$, and fix two non-negative integers m, n with $n \neq 0$ and $m + n \leqslant M$. Assume that the function $g \in \mathcal{H}^{m,n}(X)$. Consider the quantity*

$$S_{m,n}(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \kappa_i \mathbb{E}^2 q^{[i]}(X) \Delta^i g(X) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{i-1} \nu_i \mathbb{E} q^{[i]}(X) (\Delta^i g(X))^2, \tag{7.2}$$

where

$$\kappa_i := \frac{\binom{m}{i} \prod_{j=m+i}^{m+n+i-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m+n)_i \mathbb{E} q^{[i]}(X) \left[\prod_{j=i-1}^{2i-2}(1-j\delta)\right] \prod_{j=m}^{m+n-1}(1-j\delta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_i := \frac{\binom{n}{i}}{(m+n)_i \prod_{j=m}^{m+i-1}(1-j\delta)}$$

are strictly positive constants (depending only on m, n and X), and an empty sum (when $m = 0$) should be treated as zero. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$(-1)^n [\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{m,n}(g)] \geqslant 0.$$

Moreover, $S_{m,n}(g)$ becomes equal to $\mathsf{Var}\, g(X)$ if and only if g is identically equal to a polynomial of degree at most $m + n$ on the support of X, that is, if and only if there exists a polynomial H_{m+n} of degree at most $m + n$ such that $\mathbb{P}[g(X) = H_{m+n}(X)] = 1$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_k = \mathbb{E}\phi_k(X) g(X)$ be the Fourier coefficients of g. From (6.10) and (6.1) we get, as in Afendras (2013), that $(-1)^n [\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{m,n}(g)] = R_{m,n}(g)$ where

$$R_{m,n}(g) = \sum_{k=m+n+1}^{M} r_{k;m,n}(\mu; q) \alpha_k^2 := \sum_{k=m+n+1}^{M} \frac{(k-m-1)_n \prod_{j=m+k}^{m+n+k-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m+n)_n \prod_{j=m}^{m+n-1}(1-j\delta)} \alpha_k^2. \tag{7.3}$$

By Remark 2.2 it follows that $\prod_{j=m+k}^{m+n+k-1}(1-j\delta) > 0$ and $\prod_{j=m}^{m+n-1}(1-j\delta) > 0$. Therefore, the residual $R_{m,n}(g)$ in (7.3) is non-negative, and it is equal to zero if and only if $\alpha_k = 0$ for all $k > m + n$, i.e., if and only if the function $g : S(X) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a polynomial of degree at most $m + n$. Note that if $m + n = M$ (in the case where M is finite) the sum in (7.3) is empty and it is treated as zero. □

***Remark* 7.1.** (a) For fixed n and for any function $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\widetilde{m},n}(X)$, where $\widetilde{m}$ can be finite or infinite, the variance bounds $\{S_{m,n}(g)\}_{m=0}^{\widetilde{m}}$ are of the same kind, i.e. upper bounds when n is odd and lower bounds when n is even.

(b) The bounds $\{S_{m,n}(g)\}_{m=0}^{n}$ require the same condition on g, i.e., $g \in \mathcal{H}^{n,n}(X)$.

***Remark* 7.2.** (a) The bounds $S_{0,n}(g)$ are the bounds S_n, given by Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2007, Theo. 4.1, pp. 179–180), see (1.4).

(c) The results of Theorem 7.1 apply also to the special case where $n = 0$ (note that the second sum is empty and is treated as zero). In this case the lower bound $S_{m,0}(g)$ is reduced to the one given by Afendras, Papadatos and Papathanasiou (2011, Theo. 4.1, pp. 518–519), see (1.3).

***Remark* 7.3.** Regarding the conditions of Theorem 7.1 imposed on the function g, we note that $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\max\{m,n\},n-1}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\max\{m,n\},n}(X)$ implies that the bound $S_{m,n}(g)$ is trivial, i.e., $+\infty$ when n is odd and $-\infty$ when n is even. Of course, such g exist only when the support is infinite (with $\delta = 0$).

When $M < \infty$ and $m + n = M$ then $R_{m,n}(g) = 0$ and the variance bound $S_{m,n}(g)$ becomes equal to $\mathsf{Var}\, g(X)$ for any g. In any other case, it is of some interest to find an upper bound for the residual $R_{m,n}(g)$.

Proposition 7.1. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.1, with $m + n < M$, and, further, suppose that $g \in \mathcal{H}^{T,T}(X)$ for some $T \in \{n, \dots, m + n + 1\}$. Then, the residual $R_{m,n}(g)$, given by (7.3), is bounded above by*

$$u_\tau \mathbb{E} q^{[\tau]}(X)(\Delta^\tau g(X))^2, \quad \tau = n, n+1, \dots, T, \tag{7.4}$$

where $u_\tau = u_{m,n,\tau}(X) := \dfrac{\prod_{j=2m+n+1}^{2m+2n}(1-j\delta)}{\binom{m+n}{n}(m+n+1)_\tau \prod_{j=m}^{m+n+\tau-1}(1-j\delta)}$.

Proof. Using (6.10) we write the quantity (7.4) in the form $\sum_{k=\tau}^{M} \pi_{k;\tau}\alpha_k^2$. Next, consider the sequence $\{w_{k;\tau} = \frac{\pi_{k;\tau}}{r_{k;m,n}(\mu;q)}\}_{k=m+n+1}^{M}$, where the numbers $r_{k;m,n}(\mu;q)$ are given by (7.3), and observe that this sequence is increasing in k, with $w_{m+n+1;\tau} = 1$. □

In general, the upper bounds (when there are at least two) of the residual $R_{m,n}(g)$, given by (7.4), are not comparable.

Next, for n fixed, we investigate the bounds $S_{m,n}(g)$ as m increases.

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose that $X \in C$ and fix a positive integer n and a function $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\widetilde{m},n}(X)$, where $\widetilde{m}$ (with $\widetilde{m} \geqslant n$) can be finite or infinite. Then for each m_1, m_2 such that $0 \leqslant m_1 < m_2 \leqslant \min\{\widetilde{m}, M\}$, the following inequality holds*

$$\left|\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{m_1,n}(g)\right| \geqslant \zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}(\mu;q)\left|\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{m_2,n}(g)\right|, \tag{7.5}$$

where $\zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}(\mu;q) = \zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}$ *is given by*

$$\zeta_{m_1,m_2,n} := \begin{cases} \dfrac{(m_2+n)_n(M-m_1-1)_n\left[\prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)\right]\prod_{j=m_1+M}^{m_1+n+M-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m_1+n)_n(M-m_2-1)_n\left[\prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)\right]\prod_{j=m_2+M}^{m_2+n+M-1}(1-j\delta)}, & \text{if } |M|<\infty, \\ \dfrac{(m_2+n)_n\prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m_1+n)_n\prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)}, & \text{if } |M|=\infty. \end{cases} \tag{7.6}$$

For both cases,

$$\zeta_{m_1,m_2,n} > \frac{(m_2+n)_n}{(m_1+n)_n}. \tag{7.7}$$

The equality in (7.5) *holds if and only if the function* $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$ *is identically equal to a polynomial of degree at most* $n + m_1$.

Proof. Note that if $n + m_2 = M$ then $S_{m_2,n}(g) = \mathsf{Var}\, g(X)$ for every function g and (7.5) holds in a trivial way. Otherwise, we consider the, finite or infinite, positive sequence

$$\left\{\zeta_k = \frac{r_{k;m_1,n}(\mu;q)}{r_{k;m_2,n}(\mu;q)} = \frac{(m_2+n)_n(k-m_1-1)_n\left[\prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)\right]\prod_{j=m_1+k}^{m_1+n+k-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m_1+n)_n(k-m_2-1)_n\left[\prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)\right]\prod_{j=m_2+k}^{m_2+n+k-1}(1-j\delta)}\right\}_{k=m_2+n+1}^{M}.$$

Claim. *The sequence* $\{\zeta_k\}_{k=m_2+n+1}^{M}$ *is strictly decreasing in* k.

Proof of Claim. Writing,

$$\frac{\zeta_k}{\zeta_{k+1}} = \frac{r_{k;m_1,n}(\mu;q)/r_{k+1;m_1,n}(\mu;q)}{r_{k;m_2,n}(\mu;q)/r_{k+1;m_2,n}(\mu;q)}, \quad k = m_2+n+1,\ldots,M-1,$$

it is sufficient to show that the function

$$h(m) = \frac{r_{k;m,n}(\mu;q)}{r_{k+1;m,n}(\mu;q)} = \frac{(k-m-n)[1-(m+k)\delta]}{(k-m)[1-(m+n+k)\delta]}, \quad 0 \leqslant m \leqslant M-n-1,$$

is strictly decreasing. After some algebra,

$$h'(m) = -\frac{n[1-(2m+n)\delta](1-2k\delta)}{(k-m)^2[1-(m+n+k)\delta]^2}.$$

If $\delta \leqslant 0$ then it is obvious that $h'(m) < 0$; if $\delta > 0$ then it is necessary that $M < \infty$ and, using Remark 2.2, again it follows that $h'(m) < 0$ and the claim is proved.

If $M < \infty$ then the Claim shows that $\min_{k\in\{m_2+n+1,\ldots,M\}}\{\zeta_k\} = \zeta_M = \zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}$. If $M = \infty$ then observe that

$$\zeta_k \searrow \frac{(m_2+n)_n\prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m_1+n)_n\prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)} = \zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}, \quad \text{as } k\to\infty. \tag{7.8}$$

Moreover, observing that $r_{k;m_1,n}(\mu;q) > 0$ and $r_{k;m_2,n}(\mu;q) = 0$ for all $k = n+m_1+1,\ldots,n+m_2$, (7.5) follows.

If $\delta = 0$ and $M = \infty$ then (7.7) is obvious. For $\delta \leqslant 0$ and $M < \infty$ we observe that

$$\zeta_M > \frac{(m_2+n)_n \prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)}{(m_1+n)_n \prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)},$$

see (7.8), and (7.7) follows. Now assume $\delta > 0$ ($M < \infty$). Since

$$\frac{\prod_{j=m_1+k}^{m_1+n+M-1}(1-j\delta)}{\prod_{j=m_2+k}^{m_2+n+M-1}(1-j\delta)} > 1,$$

it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{(M-m_1-1)_n \prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)}{(M-m_2-1)_n \prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)} \geqslant 1.$$

Observing that

$$\frac{(M-m_1-1)_n \prod_{j=m_2}^{m_2+n-1}(1-j\delta)}{(M-m_2-1)_n \prod_{j=m_1}^{m_1+n-1}(1-j\delta)} = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{(M-n+j-m_1)_n[1-(m_2+j)\delta]}{(M-n+j-m_2)_n[1-(m_1+j)\delta]},$$

and putting $\eta_j \mapsto M-n+j$ and $\xi_j \mapsto 1-j\delta$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{(\eta_j-m_1)(\xi_j-m_2)}{(\eta_j-m_2)(\xi_j-m_1)} > 1, \quad j = 0,\dots,n-1.$$

This is equivalent to $\xi_j - \eta_j\delta > 0$, that is, $\delta < \frac{1}{M-n+2j}$ for all $j = 0,\dots,n-1$. Observe that for each $j = 0,\dots,n-1$,

$$\frac{1}{M-n+2j} \geqslant \frac{1}{M-n+2(n-1)} = \frac{1}{M+n-2} \geqslant \frac{1}{2M-2} = \frac{1}{2(|S|-2)} > \delta,$$

see Remark 2.2. Thus, (7.6) holds in any case.

Finally, writing

$$\left|\mathsf{Var}g(X) - S_{m_1,n}(g)\right| - \zeta_{m_1,m_2,n}\left|\mathsf{Var}g(X) - S_{m_2,n}(g)\right| = \sum_{k=n+m_1+1}^{M} \theta_k \alpha_k^2,$$

we observe that $\theta_k > 0$ for all k. Thus, the equality in (7.5) holds if and only if g is identified with a polynomial of degree at most $n+m_1$. □

***Remark* 7.4.** Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.2.
(a) In view of Remark 7.1(a), the bounds $\{S_{m,n}(g)\}_{m=0}^{\widetilde{m}}$ are of the same kind. From (7.5) it follows that the bound $S_{m_2,n}(g)$ is better than the bound $S_{m_1,n}(g)$. Thus, writing $n = 2r$ (when n is even) and $n = 2r+1$ (when n is odd) we have

$$S_{0,2r}(g) \leqslant S_{1,2r}(g) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \mathsf{Var}g(X) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant S_{1,2r+1}(g) \leqslant S_{0,2r+1}(g).$$

(b) For the case $\widetilde{m} = M = \infty$, from (6.7), (7.2) and (a) it follows that

$$\underset{[\text{when } n \text{ is even}]}{S_{m,n}(g) \nearrow \mathsf{Var}\, g(X)} \text{ or } \underset{[\text{when } n \text{ is odd}]}{S_{m,n}(g) \searrow \mathsf{Var}\, g(X)}, \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty.$$

Now, we compare the existing variance bound $S_{0,n}(g)$, see Remark 7.2(a), with the best proposed bound shown in this section, requiring the same conditions on g, i.e., with the bound $S_{n,n}(g)$; see Remark 7.1(b).

Corollary 7.1. *The variance bounds $S_{n,n}(g)$ and $S_{0,n}(g)$ are of the same kind and require the same assumptions on g. Moreover, the new bound $S_{n,n}(g)$ is better than the existing (see Remark 7.2) bound $S_{0,n}(g)$. Specifically,*

$$\big|\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{0,n}(g)\big| \geqslant \zeta_{0,n,n} \big|\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) - S_{n,n}(g)\big|,$$

with $\zeta_{0,n,n} > \binom{2n}{n}$. The equality holds only in the trivial case where $\mathsf{Var}\, g(X) = S_{n,n}(g) = S_{0,n}(g)$, i.e., the function $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is identified with a polynomial of degree at most n.

References

Afendras, G. (2013). Unified extension of variance bounds for integrated Pearson family. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* (to appear)

Afendras, G. and Papadatos, N. (2013). Strengthened Chernoff-type variance bounds. *Bernoulli* (to appear).

Afendras, G., Papadatos, N. and Papathanasiou, V. (2007). The discrete Mohr and Noll inequality with applications to variance bounds. *Sankhyā*, **69**, 162–189. MR2428867

Afendras, G., Papadatos, N. and Papathanasiou, V. (2011). An extended Stein-type covariance identity for the Pearson family, with applications to lower variance bounds. *Bernoulli*, **17**(2), 507–529. MR2787602

Akhiezer, N.I. (1965). *The Classical Moment Problem and Some Related Questions in Analysis.* New York: Hafner Publishing Co. MR0184042

Berg, C. and Christensen, J.P.R. (1981). Density questions in the classical theory of moments. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* (Grenoble), **31**, 99–114. MR0638619

Cacoullos, T. and Papathanasiou, V. (1989). Characterizations of distributions by variance bounds. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **7**, 351-356. MR1001133

Hildebrandt, E.H. (1931). Systems of polynomials connected with the Charlier expansions and the Pearson differential and difference equations. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **2**, 379–439.

Johnson, N.L., Kotz, S. and Balakrishnan, N. (2005). *Univariate Discrete Distributions.* vol. 1, 3rd ed., Wiley, N.Y.

Ord, J.K. (1968). The discrete Student's *t* distribution. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, **39**, 1513-1516. MR0231472

Ord, J.K. (1972). *Families of Frequency Distributions.* Griffin, London. MR0324810

Riesz, M. (1923). Sur le problème des moments et le théorème de Parseval (in French). *Acta Litt. Ac. Sci.* (Szeged), **1**, 209–225.